LECTURES

ON

RIGVEDA

(Delivered at the University of Bombay in 1914)

BY

V. S. GHATE, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT, ELPHINSTONE COLLEGE,

BOMBAY.



1915.



POONA,
Printed at the Aryabhushan Press, Poona by
Natesh Appaji Dravid and Published by
V. S. Ghate at Poona.

Price Rs. 2.



CONTENTS

ERRATA.

P.	L.				
P. 13	L. 11	*for*	púrvahutan	*read*	Púrvahútan
,,	25	,,	ह्वेणीते	,,	हृणीते
,,	30	,,	उषस	,,	उषस्
14	13	,,	पर्वतान्प्रकुपिता	,,	यः पर्वतान्प्रकुपितां
,,	18	,,	काप	,,	कोप
18	19	*after*	place	,,	if
25	29	*for*	चातुमास्य	,,	चातुर्मास्य.
26	13	,,	निवचन	,,	निर्वचन
,,	23	,,	मन्त्राख्य	,,	मन्त्राख्या
28	13	,,	ग्रन्थ	,,	ग्रन्थं
30	23	,,	अध्वय's	,,	अध्वर्यु's
32	8	,,	छन्दस	,,	छन्दस्
33	18	,,	ऋकs	,,	ऋक्s
,,	19	,,	सामंनs	,,	सामन्s
33	23	,,	ऋक	,,	ऋक्
34	13	,,	चतुथ	,,	चतुर्थ
,,	16	,,	यजुवद	,,	यजुर्वेद
35	2	,,	अथव	,,	अथर्व
40	8	,,	ब्रवात	,,	ब्रूयात्
45	28	,,	उपनिषदंs	,,	उपनिषद्s
47	1	,,	seem	,,	seems
,,	2	,,	पिताब्रह्म	,,	पिता ब्रह्म
,,	9	,,	प्रतदर्न	,,	प्रतर्दन
,,	16,17	,,	यजुवद्	,,	यजुर्वेद
,,	17	*after*	ईश	,,	belong
48	11	*for*	wih	,,	with
55	12	,,	whi'	,,	which
61	18	,,	वृत्ती	,,	वृत्ति
65	11	,,	dies	,,	bodies
73	2	,,	hymn	,,	hymns
76	1	,,	229	,,	22, 9
85	29	,,	quarter	,,	quarto
93	13	,,	amendations	,,	emendations
106	18	,,	tha—	,,	that

P. 106	L. 19	*for*	gramt	*read*	gram—
112	23	*after*	god	,,	क
120	5	*for*	observances	,,	occurrences
124	1	,,	हेच्या	,,	ह्यो
,,	11	,,	अय	,,	अर्य
,,	24	,,	अरिष्टुत	,,	अरिष्टुतः
128	13	,,	Dána—Stutis	,,	Dánastutis.
129	13	,,	छन्दांस	,,	छन्दांसि
130	5	,,	भगव—	,,	भगवः
133	16	,,	यज्ञन	,,	यज्ञेन
135	24	,,	गा	,,	गो
138	28	,,	themselve	,,	themselves.
139	29	,,	multipliod	,,	multiplied
140	1	,,	practicul	,,	practical
155	24	,,	कावक्रतु	,,	कविक्रतु
160	2	*after*	over	,,	वृत्र
163	27	*for*	India	,,	Indra
170	17	,,	जलाभिमानिना	,,	जलाभिमानिनी
176	24	,,	ामत्र	,,	मित्र
203	5	,,	(उ	,,	उ(
204	21	,,	लृ	,,	लृ
,,	27	,,	शृणुधि	,,	शृणुधि
205	27	,,	भूत्वी.)	,,	भूत्वी.
208	3	,,	in	,,	to
212	27	,,	he	,,	be
226	19	,,	वृषाकाप	,,	वृषाकपि

LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTION.

General neglect of the study of Veda—why Rigveda should be studied?—not for high poetry—nor for high philosophy—but because it is the sole means of knowing the history of the mind of the primitive man—the study essential for a right understanding of India even at present-the influence of the Veda seen everywhere and at all times-the study essential for the history of the world—important from the point of view of Comparative Philology—the marvelous effect produced by the introduction of Sanskrit to Western scholars—Sanskrit older than Greek and Latin—the contrast between classical Sanskrit and Vedic Sanskrit—*fortuna* and Ushas—some interesting facts in the history of words—the roots *kup, ram*, and *s'am*—neglect of the study of Rigveda least excusable under the present circumstances—the plan of the course of lectures, briefly stated.

Complaints are often made by students that the study of Rigveda is very dry and is absolutely wanting not only in interest but in utility also. This same spirit has, as a matter of fact, pervaded our Shástris and Pandits of the old school who spend their whole lives in the study of one or more branches of philosophy or sciences like that of grammar or rhetorics, but none of whom seem ever to have given even a passing thought to the understanding and exposition of the Vedas in general or of Rigveda in particular. And this spirit seems to have been handed

down from generation to generation, from very old times, as would appear from the fact that even Páṇini the oldest known grammarian, whose Ashṭádhyáyí has the honour of being regarded by the orthodox people as one of the Vedángas, or works specially intended as helps to the study of the Veda, deals with the grammar of the Vedic language only in a secondary manner, assigning a distinctly subordinate place to the Vedic idiom, as compared with the later Sanskrit. And the same is the case with the modern, highly popular manual of grammar, with which every Vyákaraṇa Shástri begins the study of the subject, and whose knowledge is quite essential to every Sanskrit scholar whether of the ancient or of the modern type, I mean, the Siddhánta-Kaumudí of Bhaṭṭojí Díkshita, wherein all the Sútras of Páṇini dealing with the Vedic idiom have been put together in a section by itself called the Vaidikí Prakriyá, which forms the last chapter of the book, and which is studied by a very few amongst the Shástris. The class of Bráhmans, known as Vaidikas, who can recite the Vedic texts from the beginning to the end, without a mistake, but who are absolutely ignorant of the meaning thereof, also testifies to the fact, that the systematic exegesis of the Veda is neglected. How and why this spirit came over the votaries of Sanskrit is a curiosity, especially when we remember that in Nirukta, the oldest known work dealing with the exegesis of the Veda, the author concludes his introduction to the work, with a high eulogium of him who understands the meaning of the Veda and a scathing censure of him who only repeats

the words without knowing their meaning. The verses on account of their directness and simplicity can bear quotation.—

स्थाणुरयं भारहारः किलाभूद् अधीत्य वेदं न विजानाति योऽर्थम्। योऽर्थज्ञ इत्सकलं भद्रमश्नुते नाकमेति ज्ञानविधूतपाप्मा ॥ यद्गृहीतमविज्ञातं निगदेनैव शब्द्यते। अनग्नाविव शुष्कैधो न तज्ज्वलति कर्हिचित् ॥ उत त्वः पश्यन् न ददर्श वाचम् उत त्वः शृण्वन्न शृणोत्येनाम् । उतो त्वस्मै तन्वं विसस्रे जायेव पत्य उशती सुवासाः ॥ उत त्वं सख्ये स्थिरपीतमाहुः नैनं हिन्वन्त्यपि वाजिनेषु। अधेन्वा चरति माययैषः वाचं शुश्रुवाँ अफलामपुष्पाम् ॥ *

What has been said so far is, of course, only generally true, as one can not shut his eyes to the work done in the field by Pandits especially during the period of special activity about the 14th century after Christ, to which I shall have an occasion to refer in a subsequent lecture.

The disappointment which falls to the lot of the present student of Veda is more due to the wrong standpoint which the student takes, than to the nature of the study itself. The antique nature of the language and the distance by which we are removed from the Vedic times no doubt contribute to make the study difficult and tedious, but these are nothing compared to the utility of the study and the interest which would follow from it, only if it is pursued in the right spirit.

Do you, young readers, come to Rigveda with the hope of finding the best and most interesting poetry therein? Then I am not surprised at the dis-

* Nir. I. 18 and 19. The first two verses are looked upon as interpolations by some; but that does not affect our position.

appointment which would be in store for you. You cannot expect to find in the Rigveda the smooth and melodious verses of Kálidása, nor the deep and heart-rending emotions of Bhavabhúti, nor the polished and gingling music of Daṇḍin nor the elaborate and highly finished art of Mágha, nor the deep significance of Bháravi, nor the bewilderingly complex phrases of Báṇa. You cannot find these, in the Rigveda, of the quality and degree to which you are accustomed in classical literature. All the same it can not be denied that the hymns of Rigveda, at least some of them, are such as the goddess of poetry would be proud of. The freshness and beautiful imagery which characterise the hymns addressed to the Aurora, the heroic simplicity of some of the hymns addressed to the Thundering Bull, the homeliness which pervades some of the hymns to the Agni, cannot but strike the mind of a sympathetic and appreciating student. Though Rigveda as a work of poetry cannot at all stand comparison with best samples of Sanskrit classical poetry, still it has something indescribable in it which cannot be lightly passed over. The charms of Vasantasená, the heroine of Mṛichcha-Kaṭika may no doubt be highly attractive and may possess an unparalleled enchantment for the ordinary reader, but there still remains the indescribable sweetness and innocence of Áryá Dhútá, the married wife ([illegible]) of Chárudatta, though it may appeal to very few readers.

Do you expect to find higher philosophy in Rigveda? Do you wish to have cut and dry systems of thought providing answers to such questions as—who

am I? What is the relation between the individual soul and the highest soul? What becomes of me after death?-and so on? In the Rigveda you cannot meet with the solutions of such and other problems of life. The Rigvedic atmosphere is much more fresh and optimistic than can help the growth of a thinking and philosophic temperament. System and arrangement of thoughts calculated to solve a particular problem of life are absent from the Rigveda. The philosophy of the Rigveda proper, if philosophy it can be called, is much more practical; give and take is the idea frequently met with. The Rishis with their frankness and straightness, promise to offer sacrifices to gods, provided they in return bestow on them cattle and long life, war-like sons and riches. Did I not bring to thee an offering of my prayers and oblations? Then why dost thou, Oh god, abstain from conferring on me long life and a continuity of sons?-asks the Rishi of a god more than once. Those few hymns of the Rigveda which distinctly smack of the philosophic mood and attempt to solve the riddle of life, are an exception and strike one as unvedic in character; and from the point of view of language and syntax, such hymns have been now authoritatively declared to be later in character, which form, as it were, the connecting links of the earlier Vedic thought with its later phase culminating in the Upanishads; and it must be stated here, that even these latter are far from having one particular system of philosophy. Thus, it is no wonder, if those who are familiar with the close and technical reasoning of Nyáya works, or with the flowing and lucid argumen-

tation of Vedantists like Śaṅkaráchárya, would, on opening the pages of the Rigveda, turn away their faces, through sheer disappointment.

Then, why should you study Rigveda? Because it is the sole means of knowing the history of the mind of primitive man. Rigveda is the oldest record of the Aryans whose immediate descendants we are. It belongs to a period thousands of years removed from us, of which no records, no monuments in any form whatsoever are available. It is a great fortune that the Rigveda though so old and voluminous in extent has been preserved to us in a form correct to a syllable by oral tradition in our country. In Rigveda, we are face to face with our ancestors, we see how they behaved, how they spoke, how they thought, what simplicity and innocence flowed from their hearts, what religion and faith they professed, how they worshipped their gods, what were their ideals, whether they cheerily longed for the life they lived or waited to run away therefrom, only to enjoy the superior pleasures of Paradise, or to return into that divine essence from which this life only separated them for a while, or to see themselves reduced to the same nothing from which they came to existence in this world.

But it may be asked, let the student of antiquity read Rigveda; why should every Sanskrit student be compelled to study it? It may interest him who has a natural aptitude for antiquarian research; but that is no reason why it should be included in the curriculum meant for the general student. To these persons we reply that not only is the study of Rigveda

essential to a student of antiquity, but it is equally or even more essential to the student of India as it stands at present. The study of Rigveda, I repeat, is absolutely necessary for a right understanding of India and her history even to-day. Our civilization from times of old down to the present day is one homogeneous whole and some elements peculiarly Indian have been so indissolubly associated therewith, that even our ancestor of the Vedic days, if he were to rise up once more to-day, will have many things in us which he may easily recognize. The Indian mind is the same in many respects, whether in the Vedic Age or in the 20th century A. D. If it be asked what that unifying principle is which runs through all the several aspects of Indian life and temperament, we reply, it is the influence of the Veda and the Vedic Age, which has permeated all strata of Indians and which is seen in every little act of ours. Whether it be religion, whether it be philosophy, morals, literature or social habits, we detect everywhere its presence. Our religious ceremonies may have become more elaborate and artificial and sometimes farcical in character, still we can not lose sight of the basis of the Veda. We can not open an Indian book without being thrown back on an earlier authority which is the Veda, and which is regarded as the basis of all our knowledge, both sacred and profane. The delicate poetry of Kálidása, the philosophical vigour of Kapila, the voluptuous mysticism of Jayadeva and the epic simplicity of Vyása and Válmíki, all these admirable in themselves, would, however, float before our eyes like the mirage of a desert, unless they are

provided with the historical background by the Vedas. So also all the systems of philosophy or Darśanas, and all codes of laws profess to impart the teaching of the Veda.

Not only is the study of Rigveda essential for the history of India, whether old or modern, it is also essential for the history of the world. To quote Max Müller,* "In the history of the world the Veda fills a gap which no literary work in any other language could fill. It carries us back to times of which we have no records anywhere, and gives us the very words of a generation of men of whom otherwise we could form but the vaguest estimate by means of conjectures and inferences. As long as man continues to take an interest in the history of his race, and as long as we collect in libraries and museums the relics of former ages, the first place in that long row of books which contains the records of the Âryan branch of mankind, will belong forever to the Rigveda."

Above all, the study of Rigveda is most important from the point of view of Philology, or the Science of Language. The study of languages as distinguished from the mere acquisition of languages is a growth of the last century, though it must be admitted that researches into the genealogies and affinities of words have exercised the ingenuity of numberless generations of acute and inquiring minds. Still nothing deserving of the name of science was the result of these older investigations in the domain of language. There

*Ancient Sanskrit Literature p. 63.

were merely hasty generalisations, baseless hypotheses and inconclusive deductions. As is the case with every science in its early stage, the science of language too was attended with the difficulties, viz. paucity of observed facts and a faulty standpoint. As Whitney has said*—"National self-sufficiency and inherited pre-possession long helped to narrow the limits imposed by unfavourable circumstances upon the extent of linguistic knowledge restraining that liberality of inquiry which is indispensable to the growth of a science." Thus in ancient times every one thought his own dialect to be the oldest one with which to start and compare other dialects. Until very recently Latin and Greek were supposed to be the oldest and the most primitive known languages from which every European language was derived. But the restless and penetrating investigation, which characterised the last century, changed the whole state of affairs, and linguistic scholars busied themselves with the special relationship of the principal languages of Europe with one another and with the languages of Southwestern Asia, which led to the establishment of the Indo-European family of languages.

"No single circumstance," to quote from Whitney‡ again, "more powerfully aided the onward movement, than the introduction to Western scholars of the Sanskrit, the ancient and sacred dialect of India. Its exceeding age, its remarkable conservation of primitive material and forms, its unequalled transparency of struc-

* Language and its Study—p. 2.

‡ Language and its Study—p. 4.

ture, give it an indisputable right to the first place among the tongues of the Indo-European family. Upon their comparison, already fruitfully begun, it cast a new and welcome light, displaying clearly their hitherto obscure relations, rectifying their doubtful etymologies, illustrating the laws of research which must be followed in their study, and in that of all other languages."

I may be excused for making another quotation owing to the importance of the subject. "What has been termed the discovery of Sanskrit by Western scholars," says Prof. Sayce,* "put an end to all this fanciful playing with words and created the science of language. The native grammarians of India had at an early period analyzed both the phonetic sounds and the vocabulary of Sanskrit with astonishing precision, and drawn up a far more scientific system of grammar than the philologists of Alexandria or Rome had been able to attain. The Devanágarí alphabet is a splendid monument of phonological accuracy and......the Hindu Vaiyákaraṇas or grammarians had not only discovered that roots are the ultimate elements of language, but had traced all the words of Sanskrit to a limited number of roots. Their grammatical system and nomenclature rest upon a firm foundation of inductive reasoning and though based on the phenomena of a single language, show a scientific insight into the nature of speech which has never been surpassed."

From all this you can easily see what an important part, the Sanskrit language has played in the do-

* The Science of Language. Vol. I. p. 38.

main of the seeince of language. Now the object and aim of philology is to learn what man is by what man has been. And Sanskrit philology in particular has served to supply one of the earliest and most important links in the history of mankind. Sanskrit has been regarded as a language even older and more primitive than Greek and Latin. At least Sanskrit enables us to have glimpses into the transactions of the South-Eastern branch of the Âryans, as opposed to the North-western branch. And if Sanskrit is so important owing to its primitiveness and transparency, wherewith can we begin its study if not with the Vedic idiom? The classical Sanskrit which we now know and which is accessible and intelligible to comparatively large numbers is itself a very old dialect but has been preserved to us in its pristine purity as it ceased to be a language of the people in general but continued to be only a literary dialect used by the learned alone. The Sanskrit language is to-day what it was exactly in the days of Páṇini, without any change of form or of significance of words. Thus even the classical Sanskrit is the means of studying the life and manners of a very old generation.

But this is not the case with the Vedic idiom. Though the dialect of the Veda or more particularly the Rigveda is essentially Sanskrit still it differs from the latter in many considerable respects, so much so that to a student of classical Sanskrit pure and simple, the Vedic language would be almost Greek and Latin. The Vedic Sanskrit, if I may so call it, is much simpler, more regular and less artificial than the classical

Sanskrit. The forms of declension and conjugation are more regular in character though more varied at the same time. Sandhis are simpler and far more intelligible. The Infinitive Mood, for instance, has not less than six forms in the Veda, whereas in later Sanskrit, we have only one form. All these peculiarities I shall deal with, later on in their proper place. What I want to say here is that the Vedic Sanskrit is much older than the later Sanskrit, whether the Vedic age be 2000 years before Christ or even still further removed from us ; that it represents a state of civilization nowhere else represented; that it provides us with many links which are otherwise obscure, though without them no certain conclusions can be arrived at.

The truth of what has been said so far may be illustrated by an example. Take, for instance, the modern English word '*fortune*'. The word was brought by the Normans who had it in the form 'fortûne' in Northern French. It came from '*fortuna*' in Latin. Now fortune in English means riches, prosperity, good fortune as well as bad fortune, chance as opposed to divine will and so on. The word in all these significations can be derived from *ferre* 'to bring.' One who brings good or bad luck. Fors which comes from the same root and is allied to fortune was the name of an old deity in Italy, who was supposed to bring with her good or bad, was the first-born of gods and was also sometimes spoken of, as the daughter of Jupiter, Zeus, corresponding to 'Dyauḥ.' Now who was this deity ? Was it a mere personification of some virtue or act, as Victor-Victoria, Fides–Faith and so on ?

Now if we study the mythology according to the oldest Aryan records, we find that the Dawn or Aurora उषस् was one of the deities whom the most primitive Aryans known to us worshipped and praised. The Dawn, as I remarked above, is the subject of many a beautiful hymn in the Rigveda. Now the Dawn is often described as the first-born of the bright Gods. She is called *Agriyá*, the first who comes at the head of all the other Gods, who brings, indeed, precious gifts, namely, light and life, and who is, therefore, invoked first (*prathamá*) at every morning-prayer (*púrvahutau*). The same Dawn is also called the daugther of Dyaus (Zeus), *duhitá Divaḥ*, and in other places she is like Fors represented as the mother of the Gods. There are, in fact, few praises bestowed in the Veda on Ushas, the Dawn, which cannot be transferred to Fortuna, thus showing her to have been orginally, like Ushas, the bright light of each day, worshipped from the earliest days. Thus in the concept of Fors-Fortuna we cannot but recognize a reflex of the goddess of the Dawn who brings everything, who in her lap has good and evil gifts. Attempting to trace Fors or Fortuna (derived from *ferre*) to some Sanskrit root, we have हृ 'to bring' as the most analogous one. And Fors is quite analogous to *harati* or har-ti (fert). And derivatives from हृ (हृणीते, हर्यति) are often used of उषस्. Thus हर्यत (adj:—beautiful, longed for) is one of the common epithets used of the Dawn.

Thus you see what a flood of light is thrown by the Vedic Sanskrit, on the relation between the Western Fortuna and the Eastern उषस् and the modern English fortune. It is a long journey, indeed, from the golden

rays of the dawn to the bright gold coins, by which now fortune is measured.*

Many other beautiful facts in the history of language or of words will come to view on comparison of the language of the Veda with the later Sanskrit. Thus we find that in the growth of language and thought words do often change their material into a spiritual meaning. As an instance of this I may mention two roots कुप् and रम्. In the Rigveda कुप् is used in the sense of physical motion, agitation, and रम् in the sense of 'stopping, fixing firm.' Thus in Rigveda, II-12.2, we have of Indra—'यः पर्वतान्प्रकुपिताँ अरम्णात्'. 'He fixed firm the mountains that were in motion.' The agitation is then transferred from the sphere of the body to that of the spirit; and कोप meant mental agitation, an emotion; and as the emotion of anger agitates the mind most and commits the greatest havoc, ‡ कोप came to mean 'anger' in later Sanskrit, where again we find the word used metaphorically, to denote physical agitation; as for instance कुपितो मकरध्वजः; if कुपित is literally used, then मकरध्वज must mean काम or the god of love who alone

---

* Biographies of words by M. Müller.

‡ In this connection, I recommend to the reader the following verses from Adhyátma Rámáyaṇa Ayodhyá Káṇḍa 4th Adhy., verses 35, 36 :—

तत्रापि क्रोध एवालं मोक्षविघ्नाय सर्वदा ।
येनाविष्टः पुमान्हन्ति पितृभ्रातृसुहृत्सखीन् ॥
क्रोधमूलो मनस्तापः क्रोधः संसारबन्धनम् ।
धर्मक्षयकरः क्रोधस्तस्मात्क्रोधं परित्यज ॥
क्रोध एष महान् शत्रुः ।

can be capable of the mental emotion of anger. But, if कुपित is used by लक्षणा or indication, to mean agitated, then मकरध्वज should mean 'the ocean.' Thus we see that what was once the literal meaning of the word has now been made possible only through a metaphor. Similarly in the case of रम्, the idea of fixing firm or causing to rest is transferred from the physical domain to the mental one; and what can enable the mind to rest, better than sporting or playing which causes pleasure and thus rests the mind? And even in later Sanskrit रमते preserves the old meaning as when we say 'क्रीडायां रमते चित्तम्'—So also the root शम् originally meant in the Rigveda 'to toil hard, to work zealously as at a Sacrifice'– In Rigveda II-12-14 we have, of Indra :—

"य : सुन्वन्तमवति य : पचन्तं
य : शंसन्तं य : शशमानमूती।"

शशमान is used by the side of सुन्वन्तम्, पचन्तम् and शंसन्तम्. But as toiling hard leads to exhaustion and consequent inactivity, शम् has come to mean 'to be quiet or tranquil' (which has more to do with the mind), the result of physical toiling, its original meaning.

From all this it will be seen, how very important the study of Rigveda is from several points of view. It has been my object in this lecture to bring home to the mind of the young student who has a natural dislike for the study of Rigveda, the fact what a gross mistake he commits, what a wrong path he pursues. Such dislike or even indifference might have been excusable in days of old when Sanskrit learning, especially Vedic learning, had remained stagnant; there was a time when even European Scholars who first set agoing the

stream of Oriental learning were dazzled by the ravishing beauties of Śakuntalá and took it to represent the best in Sanskrit Literature. The raptures of Gœthe,—the great German whose influence was acknowledged by most of the writers and thinkers of modern times,—on reading Śakuntalá, though only in translation, are too well-known. Others went even further and positively condemned the Vedic books. Herder, otherwise an excellent judge of ancient national poetry, says in his criticism of Śakuntalá—"Do you not wish with me that instead of these endless religious books of the Vedas, Upavedas, and Upángas, they would give us the more useful and more agreeable works of the Indians, and especially their best poetry of every kind? It is here the mind and character of a nation is best brought to life before us, and I gladly admit that I have received a truer and more real notion of the manner of thinking among the ancient Indians from this one Śakuntalá than from all their Upanekats and Bagadams"*

But those days are now gone. The *editio princeps* of Rigveda has marked a new epoch. Now Rigveda and other allied Vedic literature forms a special and important subject of study at most of the important Universities of Europe and America, an unparalleled activity in the domain of Vedic study is manifested everywhere, single words are critically studied and their history traced through all available works, historical and mythologial references are attempted to be explained on a reasonable basis, indexes and glossaries are multiplied, and even exhaustive commentaries

* Ancient Sanskrit Literature—p. 5.

following the most up-to-date canons of criticism are produced. At such a time would it not be very strange if in our University curriculum Vedic study did not find a place? When Germans and Englishmen are trying their best to understand and explain the Vedic traditions and thought, would it become us to sit with folded hands? I really am surprised to see men come forward and advocate the abolition of the Rigveda from our curriculum. Are we not best fitted by nature to understand our ancient tradition, and the spirit proper that pervades our ancient literature? Only if we make our mind free from prejudices or any preconceived notions and then apply ourselves to the study of the Rigveda, and pursue the Western methods of criticism, especially based on comparison, we are sure to arrive at the most correct and acceptable interpretation of the sacred texts. What Prof. Garbe has said regarding the Bhagavadgítá is just applicable to the study of the Rigveda. In his introduction to his translation of the Bhagavadgítá, the Professor says—'An impartial examination of the philosophical significance of the Bhag. Gítá, not influenced by any commentator, by a scholar intimately acquainted with the philosophic systems of India would be, no doubt, welcome to many.' And is it not possible to find such a scholar amongst Indians in the domain of Vedic studies?—one understanding Sáyaṇa properly, at the same time, not allowing his own judgment to be warped by the absurdities and uncritical statements that he makes,—one who can read the works in their original, at first hand, and can apply the comparative method with a spirit of inquiry open

and impartial, not biassed by undue patriotism, at the same time not so frivolous as to discover most un-Indian ideas and thoughts therein.—The task is, no doubt, very arduous and difficult, requiring patience and perseverance. At the same time the greatness of the task must not discourage you. Only if you work in the right direction, never mind, how little you do.

नेहाभिक्रमनाशोऽस्ति प्रत्यवायो न विद्यते ।
स्वल्पमप्यस्य धर्मस्य त्रायते महतो भयात् ॥ B. Gita II, 40.

Thus the objection which is brought by some against the present study of Rigveda at the B.A. examination of our university, that students merely cram the translation without acquiring the critical and inquiring spirit, must not daunt you. Even the committing to memory of the translation is necessary for making your first acquaintance with the Veda. As for the method of study to be followed, I do not say anything more to-day, as the subject will be dealt with fully in another place.

Before concluding, it would not be out of place I say a few words regarding the plan of my lectures and the principles which I would like you to bear in mind. The object of these lectures is to initiate you into the study, to show you the way and to present to you a number of facts, an acquaintance with which is quite essential for an intelligent study of the Rigveda. I shall attempt to illustrate and corroborate whatever I shall say. The presentation of facts will not only be characterized by accuracy, but also by lucidity and attractiveness. Thus it will be my aim to make as popular a demonstration as possible, which is the only means to make the study both useful and interesting.

At first I shall explain to you what Veda is, and what relation it bears to other Sanskrit Literature. I shall speak at length of the Vedic literature as opposed to Post-Vedic literature, of its sub-divisions, and review briefly some of the important works which are representative of the period to which they belong, which are typical of the class of literature of which they form part. Then I shall speak of the Rigveda in particular, its contents, the principle of arrangement which holds together the different parts, the old and late portions and how to distinguish them, in the course of which it will be made clear to you that Rigveda is not a book, but it is a library and a literature.

Next, I shall proceed to indicate the method of studying the Rigveda, comparing the merits of the orthodox and modern ways, before doing which, however, an attempt will be made to give you an idea of the amount and nature of the work done in the field, by modern scholars, as well as, by ancient Pandits. Then may conveniently be presented to you the different views held regarding the contents of the Rigveda and you may be left to judge for yourself, whether Rigveda is a mere babbling of primitive humanity or is the highest receptacle of most erudite learning and recondite philosophy. Then we shall see how our Vedic ancestors behaved with respect to the natural forces and influences of the world regarded by them as manifestations of superhuman will; in brief we shall see what their religion was, through what stages it passed, what gods they believed in, what myths were woven round them, how they were developed later on. This will be follow-

ed by a brief indication of the philosophy of the Rig-veda,-philosophy of which India is proverbially spoken of as the cradle.

Then we shall try to acquaint ourselves with the social condition of the Aryans, as far as it can be depicted from the hymns of the Rigveda. Then we shall see what food and drink they used, what ideals of education there existed, whether there was caste-system or not, whether widows were allowed to remarry or not and several other interesting topics of a miscellaneous character.

After having so far dealt with the ideas and contents of the Rigveda, we shall devote ourselves to the consideration of its form. We shall notice the grammatical peculiarities of forms and inflection, showing how full and varied the inflection was in the Vedic idiom. Next the metre will deserve our attention, metre which has been a necessary and almost a constant accompaniment of poetry, and in which is clothed a very large part of Sanskrit Literature. Lastly your attention will be drawn to the several theories put forth by different scholars regarding the age of the Rigveda, as it is determined by evidence both internal and external. All the topics referred to above will be plentifully watered with textual illustrations, especially such as bear on the text prescribed. Before concluding, I may express the hope that at the end of this course of lectures I will have succeeded in pursuading you to recognize that* 'we have in the Rigveda a literature which well deserves at least in extracts to be

* 'Rigveda' by Kaegi, p. 91.

known to every student and lover of antiquity, to every one who would have the poet's words *homo sum; humanum nihil a me alienum puto*, applied to himself. The chief importance of the Veda is not indeed for the history of literature, but it lies elsewhere; it lies in the very extraordinary fullness of disclosures which this unique book gives to the student of philology and the history of civilization. In this no other literature is to be compared with it, and though the æsthetic value of this relic of long-vanished times has sometimes been exaggerated, yet its historical importance, its value for the history of mankind, cannot easily be overrated.'

LECTURE II.

THE LITERATURE CALLED VEDA

and its relation to other Sanskrit Literature.

What is Veda?—The view of Sáyaṇa regarding the meaning of Veda--Veda is the sum of Mantras and Bráhmaṇas—Vedic and Post-Vedic Literatures—Three periods of Vedic Literature—Sruti and Smriti—The Samhitá period—The fourfold Samhitá corresponding to the four priests—Rigveda, the most ancient and important—Chhandas and Mantra—Sámaveda Samhitá—Its contents—the Yajurveda Samhitá—Black and White Yajurveda—Their contents—Atharvaveda Samhitá—Its contents—Its historical importance—The Bráhmaṇa period.—The distinction between Mantra and Bráhmaṇa. The Aitareya Bráhmaṇa—The Satapatha Bráhmaṇa—the literary estimate of the Bráhmaṇas—Araṇyakas—Upanishads--Vedánta—the meanings of the word Upanishad—the ten principal Upanishads—Their peculiar character. What do they teach?—Two views stated—The Sutra period—Their character and literary estimate—The six Vedángas—S'ikshá—Prátisákhya.—Sákhá, Charaṇa, and Párshada.—The Prátisákhya of Saunaka—Chhandas—Vyákaraṇa—Nirukta—its contents—Yáska prior to Páṇini—Two Yáskas—Kalpa—Srauta, Grihya and Sámayáchárika Sutras—Jyotisha—Anukramaṇis—Parisishṭas.

Before we proceed to discuss the relation which Veda bears to other Sanskrit literature, let us ask ourselves the question, 'What is Veda?' No logically correct definition free from the faults of *avyápti*, *ativyápti* and *asambhava* can be given. To begin with, Veda means 'knowledge' from *vid* 'to know'; Veda means Vidyá, and then secondarily the term must denote

works or *granthas* containing the *Vidyá*, the most sacred and authoritative Vidyá, works which do not require any external evidence, whose authority is not to be questioned, and which are the last resource in matters of dispute whether in religion, or philosophy or social customs etc. It would be interesting to know how the great Vedic exegetist, Sáyaṇa, tries to define Veda. In his introduction to the Veda-bháshya, Sáyaṇa first states the *primá facie* case, thus* :—"If you define Veda as the last of the three kinds of evidence, perception, inference and scripture, that will not do. The definition would be too wide, as it would include the Smṛitis of Manu and of others. For, by universal consent, *Âgama* or scripture is defined to be that which is an instrument of the right apprehension of things not evident to the senses. And such a definition appplies to these Smṛitis as well. You next propose to add 'provided it be not of human origin' and think in that way to make your definition faultless; that also will not do. For the Veda too, made as it was by *Parameśvara*, is of human origin. You will perhaps next say that by '*Apaurusheya*' you mean 'not made by a corporeal living being'. But this will not do. For, from such texts as 'Sahasraśírshá purushaḥ' it is clear that this Lord, too, has a body. But, you say, the kind of body you mean is one which is the result of the works of a previous life: The author of the Veda has no such body, and that is what you mean when you say that it is 'not of human origin'. But this also will not do. For the Vedas were produced by such living

---

* See Handbook to Rigveda Pt. I. p. 5.

beings as Agni, Váyu and Âditya. For we have such texts as 'The Rigveda was born from Agni, the Yajurveda from Váyu, the Sámaveda from Âditya', from which it must be recognised that *Iśvara* is the maker of the Vedas, as being the director of Agni and others. If you define Veda, as a collection of sayings made up of *Mantras and Bráhmaṇas*, that will not do; for it has not been yet definitely decided, what is a *Mantra* and what is a *Bráhmaṇa*. Thus there is no adequate definition of Veda".

To all this, Sáyaṇa replies as follows:—"The definition of Veda, as the sum of the Mantras and Bráhmaṇas is a faultless one; and therefore it is that Âpastamba in his Yajña-paribháshá says–"Veda is the name given to the Mantras and Bráhmaṇas".

Further on, Sáyaṇa discusses the meaning of *Mantra* and *Bráhmaṇa*, as follows:*—

"But it may be said, the definition of the Veda, according to which it is the sum of Mantras and Bráhmaṇas, is not a good definition, because no one can say what constitutes a Mantra and what a Bráhmaṇa. Not so. For the nature of both has been clearly determined in the seventh and eighth adhikaraṇas of the first páda of the second adhyáya. At the आधान rite the text is used 'अहे बुधिय मन्त्र मे गोपाय'. Now there is no definition of what makes a Mantra. Because it is impossible to frame a definition which shall not be either too wide or too narrow. If we say that a Mantra is that which refers to a thing enjoined, we shall exclude the Mantra 'वसन्ताय कपिञ्जलान् आलभते'

* Handbook to Rigveda—p. 34.

which is itself in form an injunction or Vidhi. If we give an etymological definition, and say that Mantra comes from *Manana* 'thinking', that would include the Bráhmaṇas. If we say that a Mantra is that which ends in असि (2nd per. sing. form of अस् to be), that would exclude all ending in the first person forms and *vice versá*.

Not so. It is a good definition to say that whatever the sacrificing priest calls a Mantra is a Mantra. This denomination indicates that the texts used in reminding of the performance of a rite, and others are Mantras.

उरु प्रथस्व and similar texts direct the sacrifice. अग्निमीळे पुरोहितम् and other similar texts are in praise of the gods. इषे त्वा and the texts which follow end in the word त्वा. अग्न आयाहि वीतये and texts like it are invocations. Such texts as अग्नीद् अग्नीन् विहर are directory. Such texts as अधः स्विदासीदुपरि स्विदासीद् are philosophical in character (विचाररूपाः); and so on. Thus, since the Mantras are so very various in kind, except denomination, there is no common quality which will serve for a definition. But the need of some definition has been shown by old teachers. 'Even the ṛishis could not come to the end of things taken one by one : it is only when things are comprehended under a definition that learned men can master them.' So the denomination by experts or learned men (अभियुक्तानाम्) in the words that this is a Mantra is the definition.

In the चातुर्मास्य ritual, the text is used–'एतद्ब्राह्मणान्येव पञ्च हवींषि'—now there is no definition of what a Bráhmaṇa is. Why ? because there being no limit to the

divisions of the Veda, any definition which should seek to discriminate between the Bráhmaṇa parts and the other parts would either be too narrow or too wide. The Mantra part of which we have already spoken, is one. The remaining parts have been thus summed up by ancient teachers—

हेतुर्निर्वचनं निन्दा प्रशंसा संशयो विधिः ।।
परक्रिया पुराकल्पो व्यवधारणकल्पना ।.........

It will not do to say that to define a Bráhmaṇa we have only to say that it must be one or other of these things just enumerated. For all these classes are found in the Mantras too....(इन्द्रवो वामुशान्ति हि is a हेतु. उदानिषुर्महीरिति तस्मादुदकमुच्यते is a निर्वचन). And then there follow illustrations from मन्त्रs containing the classes enumerated.

Then there is no definition of what a Bráhmaṇa is? There is, and we give it. We have seen reason to hold that the Veda is divided into these two parts, Mantra and Bráhmaṇa and we have laid down how the Mantra part is to be known. Well, whatever is not Mantra, that is our definition of a Bráhmaṇa. This very definition is given by Jaimini in the two Sútras—तत् चोदकेषु मन्त्राख्या and शेषे ब्राह्मणशब्दः, that is to say, in this Veda, there are certain exhortatory sentences to which the name Mantra is given by those who know tradition. We study the Mantras, they say. The rest of the Veda, they call Bráhmaṇa.

After having showed, that what is called इतिहास, पुराण, कल्प, गाथा, नाराशंस्यः, are only different kinds of ब्राह्मणs and are mentioned under distinctive names, just as for instance the परिव्राजकs are separately mentioned

though for that reason they are not meant to be non-- Bráhmaṇs,* he concludes—'There are therefore besides Mantra and Bráhmaṇa no other parts of the Veda. And we have shown how these two are to be severally defined. That definition of the Veda, then, according to which it is the sum of Mantras and Bráhmaṇas, is established.'

Thus you see how very vague is the connotation of the terms वेद, मन्त्र and ब्राह्मण, and that their denotation is only to be ascertained by tradition. Thus according to the orthodox view both the मन्त्रs or what we shall call संहिताs and the ब्राह्मणs go by the common appellation of वेद, notwithstanding the wide gulf between the two in point of language, form, ideas, and general standard of civilization.

Generally speaking, Sanskrit literature may be classed under two broad divisions—Vedic literature and non-Vedic or rather post-Vedic literature. (For in a sense every Sanskrit work may be related to the Vedas, directly or indirectly.) The codes of law by Manu and others, the epics, classical literature, philosophical works, commentaries and manuals, all these come under post-Vedic literature, of which a beginning is marked by the very general prevalence of the continuous *anushṭubh* metre. Vedic literature itself may be divided into three great divisions: the Mantras or Samhitás, the Bráhmaṇas and the Sútras. Of these the first two, as said above are वेद proper, while the सूत्रs are not वेद but only related to Veda or exist for the sake of the Veda. Here is the place to refer to the well-known distinction between श्रुति and स्मृति. मन्त्रs and ब्राह्मणs are called श्रुति, while the

*'विप्रपरिव्राजकन्यायेन.'

सूत्रs are called स्मृति. श्रुति is what is heard as opposed to what is composed or remembered. The श्रुति is revealed scripture, self-evident and self-authoritative, not composed by any human authors. The ऋषिs of the hymns or सूक्तs are thus called मन्त्रद्रष्टृ, the seers of the Mantras. They are not at all responsible for the contents and thoughts of the मन्त्रs. They are only the mediums communicating between God and men. Yáska, the oldest known expositor of the Veda, while explaining the genesis of the Nighaṇṭu on which he writes a commentary, says*–

"साक्षात्कृतधर्माण ऋषयो बभूवुः । तेऽवरेभ्योऽसाक्षात्कृतधर्मभ्य उपदेशेन मन्त्रान्सम्प्रादुः । उपदेशाय ग्लायन्तोऽवरे बिल्मग्रहणायेमं ग्रन्थं समाम्नासिषुर्वेदं च वेदाङ्गानि च।"

Here it is distinctly said that धर्म or law revealed itself to the rishis, who handed it down by oral instruction to their descendants to whom धर्म did not manifest itself. This is the orthodox view; hence the extreme sacredness and importance of the श्रुति. And it can be easily seen how this view came into existence and continued to gain strength. As we know, oral tradition was the only means, in early days, of communicating learning. A teacher who learnt his स्वाध्याय from his preceptor taught the same orally to his pupil, and this practice continued from times immemorial naturally led to the belief that Vedas were handed down in the same manner and it was difficult to believe how they could be composed by some particular persons.‡

---

* Nirukta I-20.

‡ Here, we need not refer to the view that the brahmans or priests deliberately spread the idea that the Scriptures were अपौरुषेय not of human origin, that वामदेव, वसिष्ठ and others were not the composers but merely the instruments of communication, with the object of attaching greater importance to the Vedas and maintaining their own superiority, since it rests merely on a conjecture.

No doubt, it is very curious that works like the Bráhmaṇas, containing a good deal of chaff, from which a grain of gold is to be now and then discovered, should be classed as Śruti, on a level with the Samhitás, especially the Rik-Samhitá, which contains simple and pure prayers originating from a pious and innocent heart, full of grandeur and elevation. It may be partly the great antiquity and partly the love of elaborate and artificial sacrificial ritual, joined to a credulity natural to those times, that may account for the fact.

As opposed to श्रुति, there is the Smṛiti, or traditional works, of human origin, which are solely based on the श्रुतिs, and which are possessed of authority, only inasmuch as they have their foundation in the श्रुतिs. As Kumárila, the great मीमांसा writer remarks:—

'पूर्वविज्ञानविषयं विज्ञानं स्मृतिरुच्यते ।
पूर्वज्ञानाद्विना तस्याः प्रामाण्यं नावधार्यते॥'

Thus everything contained in the स्मृतिs is supposed to be confirmed by something corresponding in the श्रुति and when there is an antagonism between the dicta of श्रुति and स्मृति, well, the former prevails and the latter is to be rejected in its favour. 'विरोधे त्वनपेक्षं स्यादसति ह्यनुमानम्'—It is to be noticed here, that the title स्मृति is applied not only to the Sútra works but also to the metrical codes of Manu and Yájñavalkya, which however, we have not included in the Vedic literature.

To come to the first or Samhitá period, we have four Samhitás of the four Vedas, Rik, Sáman, Yajus and Atharvan. Of these the Rik-Samhitá is the oldest and the most important, not only from the point of view of the contents, but even from the orthodox stand-point.

This four-fold division of the Samhitás evidently presupposed an eleborate development of the sacrificial ritual, as even the simplest sacrifice required the four principal priests होतृ, उद्गातृ, अध्वर्यु and ब्रह्मन्, though the more eleborate sacrifices required not less than sixteen priests.—The following verse from Yáska's Nirukta states distinctly the functions of the four priests—

'ऋचां त्वः पोषमास्ते पुपुष्वान् ।
गायत्रं त्वो गायति शक्वरीषु ॥
ब्रह्मा त्वो वदति जातविद्याम् ।
यज्ञस्य मात्रां वि मिमीत उ त्वः ॥'

The होतृ priest is to recite verses from the ऋग्वेद accompanying the offering of oblations, the उद्गातृ is to chant psalms at the sacrificial ritual, from the Sámaveda, the ब्रह्मा priest is to be a general superintendent to watch everywhere and to make corrections whenever any mistakes are committed in the general routine or particular details of the sacrifice. The ब्रह्मा is thus required to be versed in all the Vedas. And the अध्वर्यु priest creates the very form or body of the sacrifice. All the manual labour, such as preparing the altar or वेदी, placing the logs of wood in a particular position, making the oblations &c. is the अध्वर्यु's duty. For this अध्वर्यु the Yajurveda which is a commixture of prose formulæ containing practical directions for the sacrifice and metrical portions, is meant. It must be noted here that originally there were only three vedas*, ऋक्, सामन्, and यजुस्, known as त्रयी, but that the fourth अथर्ववेद

* Cf. मालविकाग्निमित्र—I, verse 13—

मङ्गलालङ्कृता भाति कौशिक्या यतिवेषया ।
त्रयी विग्रहवत्येव सममध्यात्मविद्यया ॥

which is evidently far removed in spirit from the old Vedas, was afterwards added to the triad. Thus the three Vedas presupposed their character of being subsidiary to the sacrifice. And from the point of view of the sacrificial ritual, the यजुर्वेद of the अध्वर्यु on whom falls the main burden of the sacrifice, should deserve precedence, but even the orthodox belief is in favour of regarding Rigveda as the first and of primary importance. Even Sáyaṇa, who had first commented on the Yajurveda and who then proceeded to comment on the Rigveda, has to admit that Rigveda must be given precedence 'in such exercises as the learning of all the four Vedas, the continual study of them and that spiritual sacrifice which consists in the recitation of them.' In the well-known Purushasúkta, it is mentioned first of all—

'तस्माद् यज्ञात् सर्वहुतः ऋचः सामानि जज्ञिरे &c.—'

Not only is the primacy of the Rigveda established on account of its being mentioned first; it also follows from the fact that it is the cause of strengthening or confirming the parts of a sacrifice. Thus the Taittiríyas have the text—

'यद्वै यज्ञस्य साम्ना यजुषा क्रियते शिथिलं तद् यदृचा तद्दृढमिति'—

The छन्दोगs, too, recite a speech of Nárada's to Sanatkumára, which also implies the primacy of the Rigveda—'ऋग्वेदं भगवोऽध्येमि यजुर्वेदं सामवेदमाथर्वणं चेति'.

That Rigveda is the most ancient piece of literature and most important from the point of view of study will become clear in the course of subsequent lectures, on an examination of its language, thoughts, religion and philosophy. With the arrangement of the

contents of the Rigveda in particular, I shall deal in the next lecture.

It is owing to this distance between Rigveda and the other Vedas that some (*e. g.* Max Müller in his Ancient Sanskrit Literature) have thought it necessary to have four periods instead of three. Instead of one Mantra period they have two, the first 'छन्दस' period, and the 2nd मन्त्र period. The छन्दस् period is the period when at first the different hymns and verses must have been first composed and given out as free and unrestrained expressions of the overflowing thoughts of the poetic Aryans. It is a creative and growing period, which was characterised by real poetry, when the spiritual or mental sacrifice was the only sacrifice, when a prayer was the most valuable offering that could be made to gods. To this period must be assigned the verses of the Rigveda as they first were given out. On the other hand the second period was one of compilation, and systematisation which saw the arrangement and grouping of the hymns in the form we have them at present. During this period, the sacrificial ritual gained dominance which is evidently the only guiding principle in the arrangement of the other Samhitás. Though from the point of view of the history of the human mind, the two periods are necessary, we have here contented ourselves with only one period for convenience and from the point of view of the literary products as we have them at present.

Thus leaving aside Rigveda, we shall now proceed to the Sámaveda Samhitá. In the first place, it must be stated that the Sámaveda does not really seem

to be an independent production, as it has taken many verses, a very large number, indeed, from the Rigveda. As we have said above the Sáma prayer book was specially intended for the उद्गातृ priest who was to chant the psalms at the sacrifices. The Samhitá text proper of the Sámaveda consists of two parts, the पूर्वार्चिक and the उत्तरार्चिक. The first is divided into six lessons or प्रपाठकs, each of which contains ten decades of stanzas, except the last which has only nine. The पूर्वार्चिक is also called छन्दः, छन्दसी or छन्दसिका. The verses of the पूर्वार्चिक are also classified under the five following heads—1 आग्नेयम् treating of the God of fire 2 ऐन्द्रम् treating of Indra. 3 पवमानम् treating of the God of Wind. 4 आरण्यम् and 5 शुक्रियम् Both treating of the supreme God, so named because these verses were proclaimed to the world by Aruṇa, the God of Dawn and by Śukra, the preceptor of the Asuras, respectively. The ऋक्s, when chanted, are called सामानि. The book of सामनs belonging to the पूर्वार्चिक is called प्रकृति; while those belonging to the उत्तरार्चिक constitute ऊह and रहस्य. The peculiarity of the उत्तरार्चिक is that generally three verses are grouped together and form one ऋक, and the first of them occurs in the पूर्वार्चिक; and this group of verses is chanted in various ways, with the सामन् so occuring in the प्रकृति. Hence the सामन्s of the पूर्वार्चिक are called प्रकृति. At the end of the पूर्वार्चिक comes the महानाम्नी which is considered by some as a part of the पूर्वार्चिक, by others as a separate work. The उत्तरार्चिक consists of several sections referring to the following topics in order, 1 दशरात्र, 2 संवत्सर, 3 ऐकाह, 4 अहीन, 5सत्र, 6 प्रायश्चित्त and 7 क्षुद्र.

Collections of hymns arranged in a particular way, and set to music are called गानs. I can not do more than refer only to the two modes of the recitation of the Sámaveda. One is simple and applies to the mere सूक्तs or hymns which are taken from the Rigveda generally and adopts three स्वरs, the उदात्त, the अनुदात्त and the स्वरित. The उदात्त is high and emphasised, the अनुदात्त is low and the स्वरित occupies a somewhat middling position, thus differing from the mode of pronunciaton in the Rig-veda hymns. The other mode, the musical chanting of the सामवेद is far more elaborate and complicate and has to do with seven notes called respectively क्रुष्ट, प्रथम द्वितिय, तृतीय, चतुर्थ पञ्चम, and षष्ठ, corresponding to the पञ्चम, मध्यम, गान्धार, ऋषभ, षड्ज, धैवत and निषाद respectively.*

From the सामवेद we now pass on to the यजुर्वेद, which is specially and solely meant for purposes of the sacrificial ritual and which is, therefore, quite different in character from the two संहिताs mentioned above. The word यजुस् is explained in various ways. 'अनियताक्षरावसानो यजुः' a Yajus is that, the number of letters in which is not fixed—'गद्यात्मको यजुः'—त्रिगुणं पठ्यमानो मन्त्रब्राह्मणात्मको यजुर्वेदः and the त्रिगुणत्व refers to either संहिता, पद and क्रम or to उदात्त, अनुदात्त and स्वरित. This यजुर्वेद is two-fold, शुक्ल or white or pure and कृष्ण or dark. A very curious story is told about this two-fold division of यजुर्वेद, by महीधर, just in the beginning of his भाष्य on the शुक्लयजुर्वेदसंहिता. Vyása, out of regard for the gradually degenerating intellectual powers of men, arrang-

* See the verses from नारदशिक्षा quoted in Madras Catalogue of MSS. pt. I.

ed the Veda into four groups, respectively called ऋक्, यजुस्, साम and अथर्व and taught them orally to his four pupils पैल, वैशम्पायन, जैमिनि and सुमन्तु respectively, who in their turn, handed them down to their pupils. Vaisampáyana taught the यजुर्वेद to याज्ञवल्क्य and other pupils. Once, वैशम्पायन got angry with याज्ञवल्क्य§ and asked him to give back what he had learnt. Yájñavalkya vomitted the Veda in a corporal form by the power of योग while other pupils, at the command of the गुरु, swallowed up the यजुस् thus vomitted, assuming the form of तित्तिरि birds. Thus the यजुस् became dark and were called कृष्ण and तैत्तिरीय.

या॰ however was very sorry for the whole affair and worshipped the Sun, who came to him in the form of a horse (वाजि) and gave him the यजुस्. Hence this यजुर्वेद is called शुक्ल owing to the bright form of the Sun and वाजसनेयि after the वाजि form of the Sun. All this sounds like a fable no doubt. Perhaps शुक्ल or pure may refer to the fact that the वाजसनेयि संहिता is free from a mixture with the ब्राह्मणs or sacrificial directions interspersed here and there, as opposed to the कृष्ण यजुर्वेद which is really a mixture of both मन्त्र and ब्राह्मण in one.

Bhatta Bháskara, a commentator on तैत्तिरीयसंहिता however says, in his introduction—'पूर्वं भगवता व्यासेन जग-

---

§ The cause of anger is elsewhere (i. e. Calcutta MSS. Cat. I. p. 39) stated thus—वै॰ asked his pupils to practise some austerities in order to make good for the ब्रह्महत्यादोष. या॰ seeing the inferiority and weakness of his fellows proposed that he should alone be entrusted with the austerities. At this वै॰ was enraged and thought him to be a despiser of the Brahmans.

द्दुपकारार्थमेकीकृय स्थिताः वेदाः व्यस्ताः शाखाश्च परिच्छिन्नाः। तत्र वैशम्पायनं नाम शिष्यं यजुश्शाखानामाधिपत्ये नियुयोज। स वै तं पाठं याज्ञवल्क्याय प्रोवाच स च तित्तिरये सोऽपि च उखाय उखश्च आत्रेयाय ददौ येन पदविभागं चक्रे। अतश्चेयं शाखा आत्रेयीत्युच्यते। Perhaps the संहिता might have been named तैत्तिरीय after this तित्तिरि.

The शुक्ल or वाजसनेयि संहिता of the यजुर्वेद which has fifteen शाखाs as कण्व, मध्यन्दिन etc. from the fifteen followers of याज्ञवल्क्य who first read them, is divided into forty अध्यायs, each of which is again divided into short sections called कण्डिकाs, the total number of कण्डिकाs in the forty अध्यायs, amounting to 1975. The first 25 adhyáyas contain the formulas for the general sacrificial ceremonial; adhyáyas 1 & 2, those for the new and full-moon sacrifices (दर्श and पूर्णमास); 3, for the morning and evening fire sacrifice, as well as for the sacrifices to be offered every four months, at the commencement of the three seasons; 4 to 8 for the Soma sacrifice in general, 9 & 10 for two modifications of it (वाजपेयराजसूययज्ञाङ्गमन्त्राः); 11 to 18 for the construction of altars for the sacred fires; 19 to 21, for the Sautrámaṇi, a ceremony originally appointed to expiate the evil effects of too free indulgence in the Soma drink; 22 to 25 for the horse-sacrifice (अश्वमेध). The next 15 adhyáyas which follow, are of a considerably later origin and they are called by the name of खिल or supplements in the commentaries of उवट and महीधर. 26 to 29, contain sacrificial formulas which belong to the ceremonies treated of in the earlier adhyáyas and must be supplied thereto in their proper place. The ten following adhyáyas 30 to 39 contain the formulas for

entirely new sacrificial ceremonies, i. e. the पुरुषमेध, the सर्वमेध पितृमेध and the प्रवर्ग्य. The last adhyáya has no sort of direct reference to the sacrificial ceremonial. It is what is known as the ईशावास्योपनिषद्.

The Saṁhitá of the कृष्णयजुर्वेद is arranged in seven books (अष्टकs or काण्डs) containing from five to eight lectures (अध्याय, प्रश्न or प्रपाठक). Each lecture is subdivided into अनुवाकs. The first अनुवाक corresponds with the first कण्डिका of the शुक्ल संहिता, but all the rest differ, and so does the arrangement of the subjects. Many of the topics are indeed alike in both the Saṁhitás, but differently placed and differently treated. Thus the ceremony called राजसूय occupies the 8th प्रश्न of the first अष्टक and is preceded by the वाजपेय and the mode of its celebration which occupy 14 sections in the preceding प्रश्न. Consecrated fire is the subject of the fourth and fifth books. The seventh book treats largely of the ज्योतिष्टोम including the forms of preparing and drinking the Soma juice.§

Next we pass on to the last of the Saṁhitás, that of the अथर्ववेद, which is much later in origin and which thus forms the transition from the संहिताs to the ब्राह्मणs. The text of the अथर्ववेद consists of 20 Káṇḍas, each काण्ड is divided into several अनुवाकs, and each अनुवाक

---

§ A general idea of the contents of the यजुर्वेद may be had from the following quotation from Macdonell's History of Sanskrit literature, (p. 183)—

"The religion of the Yajurveda may be described as a kind of mechanical sacerdotalism. A crowd of priests conducts a vast and complicated system of external ceremonies, to which symbolical significance is attributed and to the smallest minutiæ of which the

contains a number of Súktas. The contents of Káṇḍa I. to VII. are distributed according to the number of stanzas contained in the hymns. In Káṇḍa I. the hymns have on the average four stanzas, in II. five, in III. six, in IV. seven, in V. eight to eighteen, in VI. three; and in VII. about half the hymns have only one stanza each. Káṇḍas VIII—XIII contain longer pieces. The contents of all these thirteen Káṇḍas are indiscriminately intermingled.

The following five Káṇḍas, on the contrary, are arranged according to uniformity of subject-matter. Káṇḍa XIV. contains the stanzas relating to the wedding rite, which consist largely of Mantras from the tenth Maṇḍala of the Rig-Veda. Káṇḍa XV. is a glorification of the Supreme Spirit under the name of Vrátya, while XVI. and XVII. contain certain conjurations. The whole of XV. and nearly the whole of XVI. moreover, are composed in prose of the type found in the Bráhmaṇas. Káṇḍa XVIII. deals with burial and the Manes. Like XIV. it derives most of its stanzas from the 10th Maṇḍala of the Rigveda. XIX. consists of a

---

greatest weight is attached. In this stifling atmosphere of perpetual sacrifice and ritual the truly religious spirit of the Rigveda could not possibly survive. Adoration of the power and beneficence of the gods, as well as the consciousness of guilt, is entirely lacking, every prayer being coupled with some particular rite aiming solely at securing material advantages. As a natural result, the formulas of the Yajurveda are full of dreary repetitions or variations of the same ideas and abound with half or wholly unintelligible interjections, particularly the syllable *Om*."

mixture of supplementary pieces. XX., with a slight exception, contains only complete hymns addressed to Indra which are borrowed directly and without any variation, from the Rigveda. The matter of this last Káṇḍa relates to the Soma ritual and is entirely foreign to the spirit of the Atharva-Veda. It was undoubtedly added to establish the claim of the Atharva to the position of a fourth Veda, by bringing it into connection with the recognized sacrificial ceremonial of the three old Vedas.

From an historical point of view, the Atharva Veda is far more important than the Yajurveda, inasmuch as the former is not at all liturgical in character. We have an insight into the habits and customs of the masses in general. To quote Whitney, "The most prominent characteristic feature of the Atharvaṇa is the multitude of incantations which it contains; these are pronounced either by the person who is himself to be benefited, or, more often by the sorcerer for him, and are directed to the procuring of the greatest variety of desirable ends; most frequently, perhaps, long life, or recovery from grievous sickness, is the object sought; then a talisman, such as a necklace, is sometimes given, or in very numerous cases, some plant endowed with marvellous virtues is to be the immediate external means of the cure; further, the attainment of wealth or power is aimed at, the downfall of enemies, success in love or in play, the removal of petty pests, and so on, even down to the growth of hair on a bald pate."

The Atharva Veda is also named Brahma-Veda, or the Veda of the Brahman priest, the general director

of the sacrificial ceremonial. That this was a mere supposition to attract greater sacredness to it, while the Brahman was supposed to know all the three Vedás, is quite clear from the fact that in most of the old books, only the three Vedas are referred to. In Aitareya Bráhmaṇa 5-33, we have—"यद् ऋचैव हौत्रं क्रियते यजुषाध्वर्यवं साम्नोद्गीथं व्यारब्धा त्रयी विद्या भवति अथ केन ब्रह्मत्वं क्रियते इति त्रय्या विद्ययेति ब्रूयात्"—Even Sáyaṇa in his introduction to the भाष्य on the अथर्ववेद has a large number of passages arrayed against him, denying the character of a fourth Veda to the work. And Sáyaṇa further remarks, 'तदेवमामुष्मिकफलेषु दर्शपूर्णमासादिषु अयनान्तेषु त्रयीविहितकर्मसु अपेक्षितं ब्रह्मत्वं अनन्यलभ्यत्वात् अथर्ववेदैकसमधिगम्यम् इति स्थितम् । तद्वदेव ऐहिकफलानि शान्तिकपौष्टिकानि कर्माणि राजकर्माणि अपरिमितफलानि तुलापुरुषादिमहादानानि च अथर्ववेद एव प्रतिपादितानि ।' thereby admitting the different character of the work before him.

From the Mantras, now we go to the Bráhmaṇas and it is like passing from one world to another. The Bráhmaṇas are solely liturgical in character and pre-suppose an elaborate and most artificial development of the cult of sacrifice. All the trifling details of the sacrificial ceremonial are minutely treated and phantastic etymologies of words given with a sacredness and significance beyond all proportion attached to them. As said above, it is impossible to distinguish logically between Mantras and Bráhmaṇas. One must read both in order to have an idea of their nature. Haug, in his introduction to his edition of Aitareya Bráhmaṇa, very pithily distinguishes one from the other. "That part which contains the sacred

prayers, the invocations of the different deities, the sacred verses for chanting at the sacrifices, the sacrificial formulas, blessings and curses pronounced by priests is called Mantra, the produce of thinking....By Bráhmaṇa we have always to understand, that part of the Veda, which contains speculations on the meaning of the Mantras, gives precepts for their application relates stories of their origin in connection with the sacrificial rites, and explains the secret meaning of the latter." Though their professed object is to teach the sacrifice, they allowed a much larger space to dogmatical, exegetical, mystical and philosophical speculations than to the ceremonial itself. Their characteristic feature consists in doubt, deliberation and discussion.

The Bráhmaṇs are prose works, with a queer, old style and the syntax represents the oldest stage in the development of the Sanskrit prose. Nothing can be simpler, only if you are once accustomed to it.

Not only, all the four Vedas have got their different Bráhmaṇas, but even different Śákhás of the same Veda have different Bráhmaṇas. The title ब्राह्मण may be explained in several ways, either as the works written by the Bráhmaṇ for the sacrificial ceremonies of the Bráhmaṇas or as works relating to the ब्रह्मा priest or as works dealing with ब्रह्मन् *i. e.* prayer or sacrifice in general. The principal known ब्राह्मण of the Rigveda is the Aitareya Bráhmaṇa relating to the शाकलशाखा of the ऋग्वेदिन्s also called बह्वृच्s. A curious story regarding the origin of the work and

its title is told by Sáyaṇa in his introduction to the भाष्य on the same. There was a sage who had many wives, and one of them was named Itará. She had a son whose name was Mahídása. The father neglected him and loved the other sons more than Mahídása and at a sacrifice, he allowed all the other sons to sit on his lap, but refused the honour to Mahídása. Thereupon Itará prayed to the goddess of Earth, who appeared at once and offered a divine throne to Mahídása and seated him there. The goddess then made him a great scholar. To Mahídása Aitareya, enlightened by the boon of the goddess of Earth, there appeared or was revealed, the Bráhmaṇa and the Âraṇyaka known by the name of Aitareya Bráhmaṇa and Aitareya Âraṇyaka.

The Bráhmaṇa is divided into 8 Pañchikás or pentads, each of which contains five Adhyáyas. Thus the whole work consists of 40 chapters. Here I cannot do more than very briefly indicate the contents of the book. Adhyáyas 1 to 13 treat of the duties of the होतृ priest in the अग्निष्टोम sacrifice. Adh. 14 explains the meaning of the term अग्निष्टोम and several other matters. Adh. 15 to 17 describe the उक्थ्य, षोडश, अतिरात्र and other sacrifices. Adh. 18 contains the rules to be observed by the होतृ priests. Adh. 19 to 24 treat of the duties of the होतृ priest at the twelve minor sacrifices. Adh. 25 treats of the expiatory ceremonies to be performed by the Yajamána, the time of performing the Agnishṭoma sacrifice and the duties of the Brahman priest. Adh. 26 to 30, treat of the duties of the ग्रावस्तुत् सुब्रह्मण्य and the six minor priests at the Soma sacrifice. Adh. 31 to 40 treat of the sacrifices to be

performed by a क्षत्रिय, and the mutual relation of the Bráhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas.

The other Bráhmaṇa of the Rigveda is named कौषीतकि ब्राह्मण and represents the बाष्कलशाखा.

The सामवेद has got several Bráhmaṇas, of which the ताण्ड्य or पञ्चविंश, the षड्विंश a supplement of the previous one, are well-known.

The कृष्णयजुर्वेद has also got the तैत्तिरीय ब्राह्मण and the शुक्लयजुर्वेद has got the शतपथ ब्राह्मण so called because it consists of 100 Adhyáyas. This work, is, next to the Rigveda, the most important production in the whole range of Vedic literature. The Bráhmaṇas have not only provided the priests with the details of sacrificial ritual; but they also contain the basis of grammar and etymology which were afterwards developed to such a great extent as to attain the dignity of science. If we bring together all the scattered etymological passages in the several Bráhmaṇas, they would make a good निरुक्त by itself, and one may notice in Yáska's Nirukta, the frequent quotations from Bráhmaṇas (ending with इति ह विज्ञायते or इति ब्राह्मणम्) which he brings in support of the particular etymology he proposes. More important than this is the fact that the Bráhmaṇas contain the germs of the later epic tales. Janamejaya, the celebrated King of the Kurus in the Mahábhárata, is mentioned here for the first time, in this शतपथ ब्राह्मण. The Páṇḍus, however, who proved victorious in the epic war are not to be met with in this any more than in the other Bráhmaṇas, and Arjuna is still a name of Indra. But as the epic Arjuna is a son of Indra, his

origin is doubtless to be traced to this epithet of Indra. Of two legends which furnished the classical poet Kálidása with the plots of two of his most famous dramas, one is told in detail, and the other is at least alluded to. The story of the love and separation of Purúravas and Urvaśí, already dimly shadowed forth in a hymn of the Ṛigveda, is here related with much more fulness. While Bharata, son of Dushyanta and of the nymph Śakuntalá, also appears on the scene in this Bráhmaṇa.

To the Atharva Veda is attached Gopatha Bráhmaṇa which consists of two books, the first containing five chapters, the second six, both being evidently very late in origin.

Though the Bráhmaṇas, represent, no doubt a most interesting phase in the history of the Indian mind, still, judged as literary productions, they are most disappointing. The general impression that they produce is one of pedantry and, if I may say so, sometimes of downright absurdity. There is no lack of striking thoughts, of bold expression, of sound reasoning and curious traditions in these collections, but these are only like precious gems set in brass and lead. The general character of these works is marked by shallow and insipid grandiloquence, by priestly conceit, and antiquarian pedantry. They disclose to a thoughtful eye, the ruins of faded grandeur, the memories of noble aspirations. The decline and degeneration of the simple and pure spirit of the Rigveda is seen everywhere, accompanied by a complete misunderstanding of the old Vedic literature, resulting from

the idea that everything is subsidiary to sacrifice. How this spirit affected the general Vedic exegesis on traditionl lines, will be more fully explained on another occasion.

To this period of the Vedic literature also belong works going by the name of आरण्यकs and उपनिषद्s, which many times form only the concluding portions of the several Bráhmaṇas, but which on account of the absolutely distinct character of their contents and language also, deserve to be reckoned as a class of literature by itself. The आरण्यकs are so called, perhaps because they were works to be read in the forest (अरण्ये) as opposed to the regular Bráhmaṇas which were to be read in the village (ग्रामे). Sáyaṇa on the तैत्तिरीयारण्यक says—

'अरण्याध्ययनादेतदारण्यकमितीर्यते ।
अरण्ये तदधीयीतेत्येवं वाक्यं प्रवक्ष्यते ॥'

Or the reason might be that these आरण्यकs were the Bráhmaṇas for the vow of the anchorite, as they contain explanations of the ritual and allegorical speculation thereon. This is alone possible for the वानप्रस्थ as a substitute for the actual sacrificial observances which were no longer practicable. Thus, the आरण्यकs form a natural transition to the speculation of the Upnishads, altogether emancipated as these are from the limitations of a formal cult. Thus it may be seen that these three classes of works the ब्राह्मणs proper, the आरण्यकs and the उपनिषद्s mark three consecutive stages, not only in the Indian thought in general but in the life of every individual person. The ब्राह्मणs advocating

the actual observances of the sacrifice are meant for the गृहस्थ, the आरण्यकs whose subject is the allegorical sacrifice, for the वानप्रस्थ and the उपनिषद्s purely philosophic, for the संन्यासिन्. They mark the three distinct paths to निःश्रेयस, *i. e.* कर्म, उपासना and ज्ञान.

Coming to उपनिषद्s in particular, they mark an absolutely different path from that of the works that preceded them in the Vedic canon. The Upanishads, not known by the title of Veda, are, however, included in the श्रुति and are at present the most popular works. They are popularly called वेदान्त, inasmuch as they form the closing part of the Vedic canon or revelation or because they contain the highest and ultimate goal of the Veda as they deal with मोक्ष or Highest Bliss. They are, as it were, the kernel of the whole revelation. It is to be noted that though they are looked upon as the basis of all the six आस्तिक दर्शनs still it is only one of these the उत्तर मीमांसा or वेदान्त (not to speak of the different kinds of वेदान्त) that has received the title as such. Knowledge and not mere ceremonial, is the way to happiness, that is the keynote of the works we are now considering. The overdoing of the sacrificial cult brought on its own downfall, which culminated in the Upanishads.

The word उपनिषद् originally meant a sitting, a confidential secret sitting, in contrast to परिषद् or संसद् *i. e.* an assembly, and then, a secret teaching, a secret doctrine, a रहस्य. उपनिषद्s are frequently spoken of as :— इति रहस्यम् (नृसिंह ०८), गुह्य आदेशः (छा०. ३-५-२.), परमं गुह्यं (कठो० ३-१७.). An attempt to maintain secrecy with regard to abstruse and therefore easily misunderstood

doctrines seem to be implied in such warnings as in— 'इदं वाव तज्ज्येष्ठाय पुत्राय पिता ब्रह्म प्रब्रूयात् प्रणाय्याय वाऽन्तेवासिने' (छा. ३-११-५). One who has read the Upanishads may have been constantly struck by the feature that a teacher refuses to impart any instruction to a pupil, who approaches him, until by persistence in his endeavour, he has proved his worthiness to receive the instruction, as is illustrated, for instance, by the story of नचिकेतस् and the god of death (in कठो.) or by that of इन्द्र and प्रतर्दन (कौषी.).

Originally there must have been one उपनिषद् for every शाखा of the four Vedas, just like the ब्राह्मणs. At present we know of the following उपनिषद्s, ऐतरेयोपनिषद् representing the ऐतरेयिन्s, the कौषीतकि, the कौषीतकिन्s, both these उपनिषद्s, of course, belonging to the ऋग्वेद. छान्दोग्य belongs to the सामवेद. तैत्तिरीय, कठ and श्वेताश्वतर belong to the कृष्ण यजुर्वेद while बृहदारण्यक and ईश belong to the शुक्ल यजुर्वेद. The number of उपनिषद्s belonging to the अथर्ववेद is large, amongst which मुण्डक, माण्डूक्य and प्रश्न may be mentioned. The ten principal उपनिषद्s known as दशोपनिषद्s are बृहदारण्यक, ऐतरेय, छान्दोग्य, तैत्तिरीय, ईश, केन, कठ, प्रश्न, मुण्डक and माण्डूक्य. The उपनिषद्s are wonderful works and no sufficient idea of them can be had without actually reading some of them at least. What is this world? Who am I? What becomes of me after death? such questions are asked and boldly answered. Of course, there is an absence of a systematic uniformity about them. They are, as it were, so many guesses at truth. The freedom and breadth of thought, which we meet with in the Upanishads is only marvellous, and can be brought home to the reader if only he is reminded of the fact that not only the Ved-

ántins but also, the सांख्यs and योगs, the वैशेषिकs and नैयायिकs profess to derive their several doctrines from the उपनिषद्s which are the fundamental basis and which are the final court of appeal, in cases of dispute. I need not attempt to give a synopsis of any of these उपनिषद्s as these are easily accessible and much indeed has been written on them both in English and in the Vernaculars. Before taking leave of them, however, it would not be out of place if I refer to the question, what do the Upanishads teach, which has been answered in various ways. Many eminent scholars, along wih the orthodox people especially about Maháráshtra hold that the Śankara Vedánta represents the true teaching of the Upanishads. In spite of the many inconsistent and mutually incoherent texts met with therein, the Śankara Vedánta has best succeeded in accommodating all and evolving one definite system therefrom. According to this view the kernel of the Upanishads may be summed up as follows–

(1) The átman is the knowing subject within us.*

(2) The átman, as the knowing subject, is itself unknowable. §

(3) The átman is the sole reality.‡ It is the metaphysical unity which is manifested in all empirical plurality; thus hinting that all plurality is a mere माया.—

---

* Cf. Brih. 3-8-11; 'नान्यदतोऽस्ति द्रष्टृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति श्रोतृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति मन्तृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति विज्ञातृ—'

§ Brih. 3-4-2. 'न दृष्टे र्द्रष्टारं पश्येः न श्रुतेः श्रोतारं शृणुयाः न मतेः मन्तारं मन्वीथाः ॥ न विज्ञातेर्विज्ञातारं विजानीयाः ॥'

‡ Brih. 2-4-5. 'आत्मनो वा अरे दर्शनेन श्रवणेन मत्या विज्ञानेन इदं सर्वं विदितं भवति.'

Thus, these people say that though the expression माया in the strict sense of ignorance or अविद्या or illusion may be of a later date, still the doctrine that the universe is illusory was taught by the Upanishads; and that the older the texts of the Upanishads are, the more uncompromisingly and expressly do they maintain this illusory character of the world of experience.

On the other hand, others hold the view that the Upanishads contain no one doctrine, which appears from the fact that all the six systems of philosophy try to deduce their doctrines from the Upanishads; that even the germs of the so-called नास्तिक schools like the बौद्धs and जैनs were present in them. This view is well stated in the very first paragraph of his Vaishṇavism by Dr. Bhandarkar, which may bear quotation, as it points out very succinctly the standpoint from which we must regard the Upanishads. 'The old Vedic gods became indissolubly involved in the elaborate and mechanical system of worship that had grown up. Speculations as regards the appropriateness of the rules and modes of worship and their efficacy as regards man's good in this world and the next, became prevalent. But all this did not satisfy the religious spirit of the people. Religious speculation of a more natural order came to be established about the close of the hymn-period and was continued into that of the Upanishads. The various problems about god, man, and the world engaged the attention of many thinkers and a variety of solutions was arrived at. It is generally believed that the Upanishads teach a system of Pantheism; but a close examination will show that they teach not one, but

various systems of doctrines as regards the nature of god, man and the world and the relations between them. The religio-philosophic systems of modern times which are mutually inconsistent, quote texts from the Upanishads as an authority for their special doctrines. These references to the old books are correct in the most prominent cases but when the advocates of the systems force into other texts of an opposite nature a meaning consistent with their own special doctrines, they are manifestly wrong. That the Upanishads teach not one but various systems must follow from the fact that they are compilations just as the Rigveda-Samhitá is. The speculations of the old seers were clothed by them in words, and these were handed down orally and came to form a large floating mass'.

From the Bráhmaṇa-period now we pass on to the third and the last period of Vedic Literature, viz. the Sútra period; from Śruti we now pass on to Smṛiti. The Sútra works form the connecting link between the Vedic and post-Vedic Literatures. The style of these works, the Sútra style, is very peculiar and stands unrivalled in the history of all the literatures of the world. If the Bráhmaṇas erred on the side of verboseness and repetition, these erred on the side of brevity. A सूत्र means an aphorism, a sentence, most artificial, enigmatic and as brief as possible. The सूत्रs were like so many keynotes as it were, and everything else was to be supplied from the memory. The Sútras, from a literary point of view, have absolutely no artistic value and they are quite unintelligible without commentaries. For the sake of brevity, certain technical words or संज्ञाs and

some conventional rules of interpretation or Paribhâshás were invented, which made the सूत्रs mere riddles to one who did not first master them. The grammar aphorisms of Páṇini is the most typical production in this Sútra style. Brevity was valued more than everything else. The saving of but one syllable was regarded as a matter of greater joy than even the birth of a son and you all know how highly we Hindus, value the birth of a son. And this desire for brevity may be explained thus. The Brâhmaṇas and other works regarding the sacrificial ritual became so voluminous and bulky that it became almost impossible to remember them and utilize them. Hence the necessity of short and convenient treatises which can be easily committed to memory, was felt. Of course in the days when the ritualistic observances were actually in full vogue, these सूत्र treatises could not have been as obscure and unintelligible to them for whom they were meant as they became afterwards; for, in early times many things must have been quite familiar and plain which we have now no clue to understand exactly.

In this Sûtra literture, there stand out most prominently, the six Vedâṅgas. This name does not imply the existence of six distinct books or treatises intimately connected with the sacred writings, but merely the admission of six subjects the study of which was necessary either for the reading, the understanding or the proper sacrificial employment of the Veda. The six doctrines commonly comprehended under the title of Vedâṅgas, are Śikshâ (pronunciation), Chhandas (metre), Vyâkaraṇa (grammar), Nirukta (etymology),

Jyotisha (astronomy), and Kalpa (ceremonial), which we shall now briefly review in order.

Sâyaṇa defines a शिक्षा thus—'शिक्ष्यन्ते वेदनायोपदिश्यन्ते स्वरवर्णादयो यत्रासौ शिक्षा—It was a name given to works containing rules regarding the proper pronunciation of the Vedic texts. The prose work now known as शिक्षा (generally printed at the end of the Saṁhitâ along with other Vedâṅgas) must be, no doubt, a very modern work and one of the least successful attempts pre-supposing many similar works in the past. These शिक्षा works must have been originally embodied as chapters in the Bràhmaṇas, *e. g.* in तैत्तिरीय आरण्यक, but later in more scientific treatises known by the name of the प्रातिशाख्यs. "These प्रातिशाख्यs were written for practical purposes; their style is free from cumbrous ornaments and unnecessary subtleties. It is their object to teach and not to edify; to explain, not to discuss."† The word प्रातिशाख्य literally means 'that which belongs to every शाखा.' As the sacred texts were handed down by oral tradition, it must have happened in the course of time that the spoken language must have rapidly undergone changes, so that the language of the scriptures was looked upon as antique and old. Besides, different persons or groups of persons must have differed from each other in the matter of the pronunciation of the texts, which gave rise to different शाखाs or recensions of one and the same Vedic text. So that ultimately the necessity of laying down certain rules regarding the phonetics and metre was felt, in order to stop any further chan-

† Ancient Sanskrit Literature—p. 116.

ges. Thus came into existence the प्रातिशाख्यs each intended for a particular शाखा.

Here I may explain to you, students of Veda, the proper signification of the term शाखा and other allied words. शाखा literally means a 'branch' and is very vaguely used by the orthodox people. The four Vedas are often spoken of as the four branches or शाखाs of the Veda in general. But more properly the word applies to a text of the Veda as read and handed down in a particular school, just corresponding to our modern readings or recensions. The शाखाs of the same Veda differed very little from each other, except in the matter of certain peculiarities of pronunciation or the addition or omission of a few verses, here and there. Thus शाखा means a particular text and not a particular school. Thus a ऋग्वेदी ब्राह्मण during the performance of his सन्ध्यावन्दन, before uttering his name, says 'शाकलशाखाध्यायी' one who reads or studies the text of the Rigveda as handed down by the शाकलs, as opposed to the बाष्कलs now, however, extinct.

शाखा leads us to चरण which is also a word very promiscuously used. It is explained by जगद्धर in his commentary on the मालतीमाधव thus—'चरणशब्दः शाखाविशेषाध्ययनपरैकतापन्नजनसंघवाची' —a number of men formed into one body, as pledged to the reading of a certain शाखा of the Veda. Thus चरण denotes the aggregate of the students of a particular recension of the Vedic text. परिषद् is another word in this connection, meaning an assembly of Brâhmaṇas meeting together and containing men belonging to different चरणs. According to Manu and Yâjñavalkya, a परिषद् ought to consist of

twenty-one Brāhmaṇs well-versed in philosophy, logic and theology. Parâśara says—" चत्वारो वा त्रयो वापि वेदन्तोऽग्निहोत्रिणः । ब्राह्मणानां समर्था ये परिषत्सा विधीयते ॥" Thus a परिषद् corresponds to University which may consist of persons belonging to different चरणs or colleges. And the books or treatises belonging to a परिषद् are called पार्षदs which may contain not only the प्रातिशाख्यs concerning the several शाखाs of the चरणs but other kinds of treatises also.

There is one प्रातिशाख्य written by शौनक for the शाकलशाखा of the Ṛigveda. Another, there is for यजुर्वेद attributed to कात्यायन and the चतुराध्यायिका also by शौनक forms the प्रातिशाख्य for the Atharva Veda. Of these, I may briefly notice here the contents of the शाकलप्रातिशाख्य by शौनक, just in order to give you an idea of what kind of works these so-called प्रातिशाख्यs are. Of course, this शाकलप्रातिशाख्य seems to be comparatively later in origin as it is a mixture of Sûtras and Anushṭubh Ślokas here and there, which latter were the special dominant feature of the post-Sûtra works. It is divided into 3 Adhyâyas, each of which is again divided into 6 paṭalas of which there are thus 18 in all. The 1st paṭala treats of letters, vowels and consonants, their varieties and peculiarities and other technical matters and is named परिभाषापटल. The 2nd paṭala treats of Saṁhitâ and especially the combinations and mutations of vowels, and is named संहितापटल. The 3rd treats of accents and is named स्वरपटल. Paṭalas 4,5 and 6 treat of the combinations and mutations of consonants, the 4th and 5th being respectively called सन्धिपटल and नतिपटल, नति being a technical term meaning the change of dentals to linguals. 7 to 9

treat of the circumflex accent, 11 of the elision of nasals etc., 12 of the compound letters, 13 of the origin of letters, of the different प्रयत्नs or internal efforts, which precede the utterance of letters, 14 of the powers of letters, 15 of the rules for reading the Veda within certain prescribed times, 16 to 18 of metres, their feet and their presiding divinities.

The second वेदाङ्ग is छन्दस् which is also for the purpose of the proper reading and reciting of the Vedic texts. As seen above, the closing sections of the शौनक's प्रातिशाख्य treat of this very subject. The वेदाङ्ग work known at present is the work by पिङ्गल, which, however, cannot be the oldest वेदाङ्ग. For, Piṅgala's work treats of the Vedic as well as classical metres looking upon both as equally important. Just like शिक्षा, we have whole chapters in Bráhmaṇas and Araṇyakas, explaining and accounting for the names of the different metres. Of the Vedic metres in particular I intend to treat more fully in another lecture.

The third वेदाङ्ग is व्याकरण or grammar, which is necessary for the understanding of the Veda, and the work which now passes for this वेदाङ्ग is the अष्टाध्यायी of पाणिनि. This must not have been originally the वेदाङ्ग proper, since, as said by me elsewhere, the अष्टाध्यायी deals mainly with the classical Sanskrit, and only by way of exception with the Vedic Sanskrit. It is more reasonable to suppose that the work marks the last attempt in this province, which on account of its great merits acquired such a great celebrity as to supersede almost all that had been written on grammar before it, so that except the names and some particular rules

of former grammarians, we have little left of this branch of literature, except what occurs occasionally in the प्रातिशाख्यs.

Two other Sútra works on grammar deserve to be noticed here, both belonging to a period anterior to Pánini; one, the Sútras on the उणादि affixes and the other the फिट्सूत्रs. The उणादि affixes are those by which nouns are formed from roots, the nouns being used in a conventional sense, and not in strict accordance with their radical meaning. They are called उणादि, because in the Sútras, as we have them, उण् is the first-mentioned affix. In their present form, the Sútras seem to treat the Vedic words as exceptions.

The फिट्सूत्रs treat only of the accent and as the accent is used in Vedic words only, this second collection of सूत्रs is only meant for the वेद.

The fourth Vedánga, to which now we shall turn our attention is the निरुक्त concerning itself with the derivation or etymology of words, and as such necessary for the understanding of the Vedic text. This Vedánga is at present represented by the work of यास्क. It is necessary here, in order to avoide confusion, to distinguish the two works from each other, which are both attributed to यास्क. One is निघण्टु consisting of mere lists of words, and the other is the commentary on the same; and it must be the former work which is regarded as the Vedánga. The peculiarity of this Vedánga is that it is solely devoted to Vedic words. The निघण्टु or समाम्नाय consists of three portions, divided according to the subject-matter of the words. The first of these is called the नैघण्टुक काण्ड, where, for the

most part, lists of synonymous words are given. This portion occupies the first three अध्यायs. In the first of these words conuected with things relating to space, time etc. in this and other worlds are given. In the second, words connected with men, their limbs etc. and in the third, words expressing qualities of both the preceding objects, such as thinness, shortness etc. are given. The fourth अध्याय which forms the second portion of the समाम्नाय or the vocabulary is called नैगम काण्ड; since for the most part, it consists of Vedic obsolete words and homonyms; for this reason, it is also called ऐकपदिक काण्ड. The fifth and the last chapter of the समाम्नाय, forming the third portion is called दैवतकाण्ड; for the names of the देवताs or deities are given therein.

On this vocabulary is written a commentary which is also called निरुक्त and which is very important for several reasons. First, it represents the type of the earliest classical style and in this respect stands by itself. Secondly, it is the oldest known attempt in the field of the Vedic exegesis, unparalled in respect of ingenuity and boldness, at the same time, firmly founded on the material provided by the Bráhmaṇas and Araṇyakas, which are full of passing references to etymological explanations of words.

This Nirukta consists of twelve chapters followed by two more परिशिष्ट अध्यायs; each chapter being divided into several खण्डs or sections. Of these the first three adhyâyas form the नैघण्टुककाण्ड dealing with the words in the first three adhyâyas of the original Nighaṇṭu. Adhyâyas 4 to 6 form the Naigama or Aikapadika

Kâṇḍa, dealing with the Vedic obsolete words contained in adhyâya 4 of the Nighaṇṭu. And the remaining six adhyâyas form the Daivata Káṇḍa, corresponding to the 5th adhyâya of the Nighaṇṭu. The most interesting portion is the introduction which covers the whole of the first adhyâya and a part of the 2nd, as well as the seventh adhyâya which is a nice and brief introduction to the study of the Veda.

Yâska begins with 4 parts of speech, नाम, आख्यात, उपसर्ग and निपात–nouns, verbs, prepositions and other indeclinables which he defines and distinguishes from each other clearly; and then proceeds to establish the main stand-point of the school to which he belongs, viz. that all nouns are derived from verbs, after refuting in his own way all that can be said against the same. I abstain from quoting the discussion in full, since a separate course of lectures bearing on Nirukta alone has been arranged for you. However, I cannot but quote the remarks of MaxMüller in this connection.–* "I doubt whether even at present, with all the new light which comparative philology has shed on the origin of words, questions like these could be discussed more satisfactorily than they were by Yâska. Like Yâska, we maintain that all nouns have their derivation, but like Yâska, we must confess that this is a matter of belief rather than of proof. We admit with Yâska, that every noun was originally an appellative and in strict logic, we are bound to admit that language knows neither of homonyms nor synonyms. But granting

*Ancient Sanskrit Literature —p. 168—169.

that there are such words in the history of every language, granting that several objects sharing in the same predicate, may be called by the same name, and that the same object possessing various predicates, may be called by the different names, we shall find it as impossible as Yâska to lay down any rule why one of the many appellatives became fixed in every dialect as the proper name of the Sun, the Moon, or any other object or why generic words were founded on one predicate rather than another. All we can say is what Yâska says, it was so स्वभावत: by itself, from accident, through the influence of individuals, of poets or law-givers. It is the very point in the history of language, where languages are not amenable to organic laws, where the science of language ceases to be a strict science, and enters into the domain of history."

Next Yâska proceeds to explain the purpose served by Nirukta, in which connection, there is a very interesting discussion whether the Mantras of the Veda (for whose understanding Nirukta is mainly intended) are possessed of a meaning or not. Even in Yâska's time it appears that the Vedic language had become old and antique and the Vedas were so far removed in time that such questions as the above could be freely and boldly discussed. He concludes the first chapter with some verses eulogising him who knows the meaning of the Vedas. The second chapter opens up with a statement of the canons which he lays down for the derivation of words. In the case of those words where the accentuation and formation are grammatically regular and where there is a direct

connection between the meaning of the word and the appellative power of the root, they should be accordingly treated, (there is no difficulty), but where no such thing is possible, we should only look to the sense of the word and try to derive either on the ground of some common meaning or even of some common letters. It is with the 5th Khaṇḍa of the 2nd adhyâya that the derivation of the regular lists of words begins.

I cannot leave this subject, without asking each and every student of Ṛigveda to read the book and to remember, that but for Yâska's attempts at explanation, howsoever unreasonable they might appear to us sometimes, though the existence of some traditional authority for the interpretations and derivations he offers is implied, many a verse of Ṛigveda would have remained absolutely unintelligible to us. I may, however, briefly refer to two points. The first is that Yáska is far prior to Pánini as is evident from the facts that पाणिनि quotes his name in the Sútra 'यस्कादिभ्यो गोत्रे' (II. 4. 63.), that many grammatical संज्ञाs occur in पाणिनि's work, which he does not define, being probably well known in his time and having been already well defined and explained by his predecessors; whereas in the very beginning af Yáska's work, it is thought necessary to explain the distinction between nouns and verbs. The same follows from the fact that an improvement on the treatment of prepositions is to be observed in Páṇini's grammar, both as regards the different sub-divisions of them and their meanings. The second point to be noticed is that Yáska, the author of the Nirukta is a different person from Yáska, the author of the Nigha-

ṇṭu and for the following reasons—Yáska himself says towards the end of the first adhyáya of the Nirukta, that there were Rishis who had a direct revelation of Dharma. They communicated the Mantras by oral instruction, to those who came after them and had not such a knowledge. Their successors again becoming unfit for oral instruction, prepared this work (*i. e.* the Samámnáya or Nighaṇṭu), the veda and the Vedángas.' Here Yáska the author of Nirukta distinctly says that the निघण्टु was the work of some former ऋषिs. The second argument in the same direction is that although Yáska invariably explains the words, just according to their order in the Nighaṇṭu, he in one case makes an exception viz., with the words दावने and अकूपारस्य (IV. 17). In illustrating the use of these words, Yáska quotes a part of a verse from the Veda in which both the words occur, but in a different order. On this दुर्ग in his वृत्ति on the Nirukta remarks.—'The order of the words in the Mantra is अकूपारस्य दावने but in the Samámnáya, the order is the reverse of that in the Mantra namely दावने अकूपारस्य. Hence it is known that the Samámnáya is related by some Rishis and that the commentator is different from them. Lastly at the conclusion of his work, Yáska says—'A salutation to Yâska.' Here he must have been doubtless thinking of his ancestor, who was the author of the Samámnáya.

The fifth Vedánga is कल्प or ritual, which is specially intended for the proper application of the Vedic texts. The कल्पसूत्रs proper are based upon the Bráhmaṇas which are full of rich material, and these presuppose a methodical and fixed distribution of the

sacrificial ritual amongst the different kinds of priests. They contain the rules referring to the sacrifices, with the omission of all things which are not immediately connected with the ceremonial. They are more practical than the Bráhmaṇas which for the most part are taken up with mystical, historical, mythological, etymological and theological discussions. The following remarks of Sáyaṇa in his commentary on the Baudháyana Sútras will serve to give us an idea of the nature and purpose of the Kalpasútras—'तत्र तावद्विध्यर्थवादमन्त्रात्मना त्रिधा व्यवस्थितो वेदराशिः । विधिविहितमर्थवादप्ररोचितं मन्त्रेण स्मृतमभ्युदयकारि भवतीति । ततश्च चोदितानां कर्मणां सुखावबोधाय भगवान् बौधायनः कल्पमकल्पयत् । यतो ब्राह्मणानामानंत्यं दुरवबोधतया .....अतो न तैः सुखं कर्मावबोध इति कल्पसूत्राणीमानि प्रतिनियतशाखांतरानंगीचक्रुः पूर्वाचार्याः । कल्पस्य वैशद्यलाघवकार्त्स्न्यप्रकरणशुद्ध्यादिभिः प्रकर्षैर्युक्तस्य । etc.'*

There are two कल्पसूत्रs for the होतृ priests,—one by आश्वलायन, and the other by शाङ्खायन. Of these the आश्वलायन श्रौतसूत्रs are divided into two main parts, each part consisting of 6 Adhyáyas, and each Adhyáya being again divided into several कण्डिकाs. They deal with दर्श and पौर्णमास and such other Vaidic sacrifices. Those of you who would like to know more about the work, I may refer to the edition in the Bibliotheca Indica, which also contains a good synopsis of the several topics treated therein.

There are several Sútras for the अध्वर्यु priest, of which the Sútras of बोधायन and आपस्तम्ब belonging to the कृष्णयजुर्वेद and those of कात्यायन to the शुक्लयजुर्वेद may be mentioned here. The सूत्रs for the ceremonial of the

*A. S. L.—p. 170. 'The कल्पसूत्रs have the advantage of being clear, short, complete and correct.'—

उद्गातृ priests who followed the सामवेद are ascribed to लाट्यायन and द्राह्यायण both following the authority of the ताण्डयब्राह्मण.

"The कल्पसूत्रs are important in the history of Vedic Literature, because they not only mark a new period of literature and a new purpose in the literary and religious life of India, but they contributed to the gradual extinction of the numerous Brâhmaṇas which to us are, therefore, only known by name. The introduction of a Kalpa-Sûtra was the introduction of a new book of liturgy......In a short time, the authors of Kalpasûtras became themselves the founders of new charaṇas, in which the Sûtras were considered the most essential portion of the sacred literature, so that the hymns and Brâhmaṇas were either neglected or kept up under the name of "the hymns and Brâhmaṇas of the new charaṇas" having ceased to form by themselves the foundation of an independent tradition or school." *

To this same class of literature also belong two other classes of Sûtras, the Gṛihya Sûtras and the Sâmayâchârika Sûtras. Both are included under the common title of Smârta Sûtras, in opposition to the श्रौत सूत्रs, noticed above. These latter deal with rites and sacrifices enjoined by the Vedas and thus derive their authority from श्रुति (*i. e.* मन्त्रs and ब्राह्मणs.) The former, however, derive their authorty from स्मृति or immemorial tradition. The गृह्य Sûtras deal with ceremonies performed by the married house-holders

* A. S. L. p. 186, 187.

chiefly for the benefit of the family; where as the सामयाचारिक Sútras deal with rules to be observed by the rising generation regulating the various relations, of everyday life. It is these, also called as धर्मसूत्रs, in which are to be discovered the originals of the later metrical law-codes such as मनुस्मृति, याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति and others. Of the गृह्य सूत्रs there may be mentioned here, the पारस्कर गृह्यसूत्र belonging to the माध्यंदिन शाखा of the यजुर्वेद, the गोभिल गृह्यसूत्र for सामवेद, and the आश्वलायन and शाङ्खायन गृह्यसूत्रs for the ऋग्वेद. The आश्वलायन गृह्यसूत्र consists of four adhyáyas, being sub-divided into 24,10, 12 and 2 कण्डिकाs or sections respectively. The topics dealt with, are पाकयज्ञ or the sacrificial ceremony which is intended to impart to a man excellence or perfection, a peculiar fitness without which he would be excluded from the sacrifices, and from all the benefits of his religion, देवेभ्यो बलिहरण offering oblations to Gods, चौलकर्म or the ceremony of cutting the hair of the child born, उपनयन or the ceremony of investing him as a student and handing him over to a गुरु, under whose care he is to study the scriptures and to perform all the offices of a ब्रह्मचारिन् or a religious student, समावर्तन or returning from the गुरु's house, after having served his apprenticeship and grown up to manhood, विवाह or marriage and other ceremonies relating to the life of a householder, domestic rites in which certainly there is more of human interest than in the great sacrifices described in the श्रौत सूत्रs. The offerings themselves are generally of a simple nature and the ceremonial does not require the assistance of a large class of professional priests. A log of wood placed on the fire of the hearth, an

oblation poured out to the gods or alms given to the Brâhmaṇas, this is what constitutes a पाकयज्ञ*. In all this गृह्य ritual, is disclosed that deep-rooted tendency in the heart of man to bring the chief events of human life in connection with a higher power, and to give to our joys and sufferings a deeper significance and a religious sanctification.

The last वेदाङ्ग to be noticed is ज्योतिष or astronomy which is represented by one little tract, the object of which is not to teach astronomy, but a mere practical one, viz. to convey such knowledge of the heavenly bodies as is necessary for fixing the days and hours of the Vedic sacrifices. Even in Brâhmaṇas and Âraṇyakas we find frequent allusions to astronomical subjects, and even in the hymns we find traces which indicate a certain advance in the observation of the moon, as the measurer of time. It is note-worthy that the name of the moon is the same‡ in Sanskrit, Greek and German and that it is derived from a root which originally means 'to measure'. So also the intercalary month is referred to in Ṛigveda I. 25-8.

So far we have described the six Vedâṅgas which form the most important literature of the Sûtra period. So also we noticed above the Gṛihya and Sâmayâchârika Sûtras. Now I have to draw your attention to some miscellaneous works of less importance belonging to this period, which scarcely deserve the name of literature. Such, for instance, are the Anukramaṇis or

* The several kinds of spiritual or metaphorical यज्ञs described in Adh. IV. of Bhag-Gita may be noticed in this connection.

‡ der Mond (Ger.).

systematic indices to various portions of the ancient Vedic literature. Amongst these stands out most prominently the Sarvânukramaṇî of Ṛigveda, by Kâtyâyana. It gives the first words of each hymn, the number of verses, the name and family of the poets, the names of the deities, and the metres of every verse. Shaḍguruśishya tells us in his Vedârthadîpikâ, a commentary of this Sarvânukramṇî, that before Kâtyâyana, there existed one index of the poets, one of the metres, one of the deities, one of the Anuvâkas, the old chapters of the Ṛigveda and one of the hymns, and that these indices were composed by Śaunaka, to whom the well-known work Bṛihad-devatâ is also ascribed. For Yajurveda, there are three Anukramaṇís, one for the आत्रेयी शाखा of the Taittiriyas, the other for the शाखा of the चारायणीयs and the third for the माध्यन्दिन शाखा of the वाजसनेयिन्s. For Sâma-Veda the oldest अनुक्रमणी is the आर्षेय ब्राह्मण, other existing अनुक्रमणीs being much later. For the Atharva-Veda, there is one बृहत्सर्वानुक्रमणी.

Besides these अनुक्रमणीs there is a class of works called the परिशिष्टs or appendices, which deserve a mention in passing. One of them is the चरणव्यूह ascribed to शौनक, a treatise on the various schools into which the Vedas had branched off, briefly narrating the traditions relating thereto.

The style of the Pariśishṭas is less concise than that of the Sûtras. The simple anushṭubh śloka preponderates. Still the Pariśishṭas have not yet fallen into that monotonous uniformity, which we find in works like the Mânava-Dharma-Sûtra or the later Purâṇas. They, therefore, may be considered the

very last outskirts of Vedic literature, but they are Vedic in their character and they must be supposed to have originated at the expiring moments of the Vedic ages. Their object is to supply information on the theological or ceremonial points which had been passed over in the Sûtras, most likely because they were not deemed of sufficient importance, or because they were supposed to be well-known to those more immediately concerned. And what they treat, they treat in a popular and superficial manner; and they show clear traces of intellectual and literary degeneracy.

LECTURE III.

THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE RIGVEDA.

Rigveda is not a book—but it is a library and a literature—Its unique character—Principles of arrangement—Ashṭaka, Adhyâya and Varga—Maṇḍala, Anuváka and Súkta—Rishi, Devatá and Chhandas—The internal arrangement of the several Maṇḍalas—The Válakhilya hymns—The Apri hymns—Earlier and later Rishis—The criteria for distinguishing between older and later hymns—grammatical forms—vocabulary, peculiarities of Sandhi—Metre—Rigveda hymns found in Atharvaveda—Criterion of ideas.

In the course of the last lecture, I tried to give you a general idea of the literature known as Vedic including both the Veda proper and works related thereto. In this lecture I mean to deal with one book in particular and that is the संहिता of the ऋग्वेद. Here, however, in the beginning, I have to give you a caution, that when we call Ṛigveda a book, we must not understand the statement literally. If a book means a work written by one man, with unity of time and ideas, well, Ṛigveda is far from being a book. It is rather a literature in itself, a library composed of several books which can be individually distinguished from each other. The form in which at present we have the संहिता of the ऋग्वेद clearly shows that the different hymns were composed long before they were brought

together and systematically arranged with certain principles underlying. That the different portions of the Saṁhitá represent different stages chronologically follows from various indications of language, vocabulary and style, grammatical inflections, metre and last of all, ideas. As said in my last lecture, Ṛigveda as a work of literature stands by itself, in point of language and thoughts apart from other works belonging to the Vedic canon. There is something which characterises Ṛigveda and stamps it with an individuality of its own. In spite of this unity, however, there is a variety or plurality in the Ṛigveda itself. This is the most important thing which every student of Ṛigveda must bear in mind, and which never struck the orthodox exegesists. Though Ṛigveda is much more natural in character than other Saṁhitás and is not purly liturgical like others, still there are distinct principles of a deliberate arrangement and the influence of priests, which would be made clear, when we consider the divisions into which the whole of the Ṛigveda Saṁhitá is divided.

There are two ways of dividing the contents of the Ṛigveda, one into Ashṭakas, Adhyáyas, and Vargas, and the other into Maṇḍalas, Anuvákas and Súktas. Of these, the former is not at all important and nothing but mere convenience of study is at its root. Ṛigveda is divided into eight Ashṭakas, each Ashṭaka consists of eight Adhyáyas, and each Adhyáya consists of several Vargas, a Varga being usually made up of five ऋक्s or verses, sometimes more or less. This is the division popular with the वैदिकs with whom a वर्ग is the measure

of a lesson. This division is purely mechanical and comparatively modern.

The second division, however, though no doubt mechanical in character, has, however, some scientific historical principles to support it. That it is very old follows from the fact that it was known even to the ब्राह्मणs. There are ten Maṇḍalas. The first Maṇḍala contains twenty-four Anuvákas or sections, the second, four, the third and fourth, five each, the fifth, sixth and seventh, six each, the eighth, ten, the ninth, seven and the tenth, twelve Anuvákas. Each अनुवाक consists of a number of सूक्तs or hymns, not the same for all and each सूक्त is made up of a number of verses or ऋच्s. Before we understand the principle of arrangement which underlies this division, it is necessary to remember that every Súkta has a ऋषि, देवता and छन्दस् a seer (or we may say, a composer), a deity and a metre, without whose knowledge the meaning of a hymn can not be properly understood nor can the hymn be efficiently applied. अविदित्वा ऋषिं छंदो दैवतं योगमेव च। योऽध्यापयेज्जपेद्वापि पापीयाञ्जायते तु सः॥ Sáy. Intr. p. 73.

What these ऋषि, देवता and छन्दस् mean is briefly stated by Kátyáyana in the beginning of his Sarvánukramaṇí. 'यस्य वाक्यं स ऋषिः। या तेनोच्यते सा देवता। यदक्षरपरिमाणं तच्छन्दः। अर्थेप्सव ऋषयो देवताश्छन्दोभिरुपाधावन्।' About the देवताs and छन्दs I shall speak more fully in subsequent lectures. As for the ऋषिs, I have told you already that they are not, from the orthodox point of view, regarded as composers or writers but as seers, as Sáyaṇa remarks in his commentary of the very first

verse of Ṛigveda, 'अतीन्द्रियस्य वेदस्य परमेश्वरानुग्रहेण प्रथमतो दर्शनाद् ऋषित्वम् etc.'

Now coming back to our ten Maṇḍalas, we notice that Maṇḍalas, 2 to 7 are homogeneous in character and arrangement, while 1, 8, 9, and 10 have different principles underlying them. The Maṇḍalas from 2 to 7 are each of them ascribed to one Ṛishi or one family of Ṛishis. Thus the ऋषिs of these मण्डलs are गृत्समद, विश्वामित्र, वामदेव, अत्रि, भरद्वाज, and वसिष्ठ respectively or their descendants. Not only the existence of a common seer characterises these मण्डलs, but even there are definite principles prevailing in the sequence of the hymns in each मण्डल itself. Thus as a rule, the first group of hymns in each Maṇḍala is addressed to Agni, the 2nd to Indra, and the rest to miscellaneous deities. Further the arrangement of the hymns in each of the groups proceeds on the principle that every following hymn has a less number of verses or ऋचs than the preceding one with only a very few exceptions of hymns about whose character there prevails a doubt. As an example of this diminishing order of verses, we may examine the 7th Maṇḍala with which we would be more particularly concerned.

	Hymns following the law.	Exceptions.
Agni-group ...	1–14 ...	15–17
Indra ...	18–30 ...	31–33
Viśvedevás ...	34–54 ...	55
Maruts ...	56–58 ...	59
Súrya, Maruts and Varuṇa ...	60–65 ...	66

Aśvins	...	67-73	...	74
Ushas	...	75-80	...	81

Thus it may be seen that all violations of the law of the diminishing number of verses occur at the end of a group. The probable explanation may be that the shortest hymns which stand at the end of each group, were at sometime through whim or misunderstanding combined. So also if allowance is made for later additions, it may be seen that these books 2 to 7 form a series of collections which contain a successively increasing number of hymns.

No such definite principle of arrangement can be discovered with regard to the 8th book, though the Kaṇva family predominates amongst its Ṛishis.

The ninth Maṇḍala has a peculiarity of its own as far as the arrangement is concerned. All the hymns in this Maṇḍala are, without exception, addressed to one deity and that is the Pavamána Soma. The hymns are composed by the same Ṛishis as those of books, 2 to 7. Thus it may be probable that all the Soma hymns of the Ṛishis of books 2 to 7 were, as it were, taken out and collected together into one separate book, and at the same time arranged with regard to the metre. Thus we see, that hymns 1-67 are in Gáyatrí metre, 68-86, in Jagatí, 87-97 in Trishṭup, and the rest 98-144 in miscellaneous metres.

Maṇḍalas 1 and 10 form the youngest portion of Ṛigveda. Of these, Maṇḍala 1 contains 14 groups each ascribed to one common Ṛishi and having hymns arranged with regard to the deities, thus showing the same principles of arrangement as characterise books 2 to 7.

Thus to take an instance the first group of Maṇḍala 1. is made up of 11 hymn all ascribed to वैश्वामित्र मधुच्छन्दस्, of which hymn 1 is addressed to Agni, 2 to Vayu, 3 to Aśvins and Indra and the rest all to Indra.

Thus it may be likely that these shorter collections forming book 1, were later prefixed, as it were, to the family books (i. e. 2 to 7), which latter must have served as the model for the internal arrangement of the former.

The tenth Maṇḍala is indeed an aggregate of supplementary hymns clearly showing their familiarity with the 1st nine books. The only unity which connects the different hymns of the Maṇḍala is chronological. In this Maṇḍala, we find a series of collections arranged in the descending order of the number of hymns in each, and extending from X 1 to X 84. From X 85 to 191, we find single hymns arranged in the descending order of the number of stanzas contained in each.

From all this it appears that Maṇḍalas 2 to 7 generally formed the oldest portion, the nucleus, as it were, to which M. 1 was prefixed and M. 8, 9 and 10 were affixed. That even the ancient Bráhmins looked upon the Ṛigveda as made up of three portions, follows from the fact that the Ṛishis were divided broadly into three divisions— 1st शतर्चिनः i. e. those of 100 verses, (meaning the ऋषिs of the 1st Maṇḍala each of whom seems to have contributed nearly 100 verses.); 2ndly माध्यमा:s i. e. the middle ones (referring to the

Ṛishis of 2 to 7) and 3rdly क्षुद्रसूक्ताः and महासूक्ताः *i.e.* Ṛishis of shorter and longer hymns.*

We have also to notice here a group of eleven hymns known by the name of 'Válakhilya' which stands by itself and which is generally put at the end of the 8th Maṇḍala. They are printed as hymns Nos. 49 to 59 of Maṇ. VIII. in MaxMüller's edition. They are not recognised by older writers, not reckoned in the division of Maṇḍalas and Anuvákas, not commented on by Sáyaṇa, though mentioned in Kátyáyana's Sarvánukramaṇí. That these do not naturally belong to the place where they are found, is quite clear. The earliest interpretation of the name Válakhilya is found in Taittiríyáraṇyaka I. 23. 'स तपोऽतप्यत। स तपस्तप्त्वा शरीरमधूनुत। तस्य यन्मांसमासत्तितोऽरुणाः केतवो वातरशना ऋषय उदतिष्ठन्। ये नखास्ते वैखानसाः। ये वालास्ते वालखिल्याः।' Thus we see here that the word बाल or वाल in वालखिल्य is taken not in the sense of 'a child', but 'hair.' The fact that that these disturb the regularity of both the Maṇḍala and Ashṭaka divisions shows that they were later additions.

I have also to notice here the आप्री hymns which are peculiar in character. They resemble the hymns which we find in the Sáma and Yajurvedas, being evidently composed for sacrificial purposes. There are ten of these scattered about in the ten Maṇḍalas. They generally contain 11 verses each, addressed to eleven separate deities in the following order—verse 1 to

---

* Cf. Aśvaláyana Gṛihya Sútra. III. 4.—'अथ ऋषयः शतर्चिनो माध्यमा गृत्समदो विश्वामित्रो वामदेवोऽत्रिर्भरद्वाजो वसिष्ठः प्रगाथाः पावमान्यः क्षुद्रसूक्ता महासूक्ता इति etc.'

Agni सुसमिद्ध, 2 to तनूनपात् or नराशंस (two aspects of Agni.), 3 to इळाs or gifts, 4 to बर्हिः or sacrificial pile of grass, 5 to देवीः द्वारः, 6 to उषासानक्तौ, 7 to दैव्यौ होतारौ (i. e. Agni and Âditya etc.), 8 to सरस्वती, इळा and भारती, 9 to त्वष्टृ (the creator,) 10 to वनस्पति, (the tree of the sacrifice), and 11 to स्वाहाकृतिs. See for instance VII. 2. The position of these artificial hymns necessarily pre-supposes a deliberate arrangement on the part of the collectors.

You have to remember that the text of the Rigveda is found in two forms, संहिता and पदपाठ. In the latter the words or पदs are separately shown; whereas in the former, they are combined by the rules of Sandhis. Now we find that six verses in the Rigveda (VII. 59. 12; X. 20. 1; X. 121. 10; X. 190. 1—3) are not found analysed in the Pada-text, but only given there, over again in the Saṁhitá form. This shows that these verses were not acknowledged as truly Rigvedic, a view justified by internal evidence.

So far we have shown, only on the ground of the external arrangement of the different hymns, that the Rigveda can not be one book but many books, to the older amongst which, the younger ones were later prefixed or affixed. There are, however, other considerations also which point in the same direction when once we proceed from the historical point of view.

In the hymns, themselves, we have indications of the earlier and later generations of Rishis, and also of earlier and later hymns. Here I would content myself with giving references from the 7th Maṇḍala only.

18.1–त्वे ह यत्पितरश्चिन्न इन्द्र विश्वा वामा जरितारो असन्वन् ।,229.. ये च पूर्वे ऋषयः ये च नूत्नाः इन्द्र ब्रह्माणि जनयन्त विप्राः । , 29. 4–उतो घा ते पुरुष्या इदासन् येषां पूर्वेषामशृणोः ऋषीणाम् ।, 53.1 ते चिद्धि पूर्वे कवयो गृणन्तः ।' 76.4 त इद् देवानां सधमाद आसन् ऋतावानः कवयः पूर्व्यासः। 91·4 पुरा देवा अनवद्यास आसन् ।

In all these passages old and new ऋषिs are distinctly spoken of.

56.23 भूरि चक्र मरुतः पित्र्याणि उक्थानि।, 15.4 नवं नु स्तोममग्नये दिवः श्येनाय जीजनम् ।, 59.4 अभि व आवर्त् सुमति नेवीयसी, । 61.6 प्र वां मन्मानि ऋचसे नवानि कृतानि ब्रह्म जुजुषन् इमानि ।, 93·1 शुचिं नु स्तोमं नवजातमद्य इन्द्राग्नी वृत्रहणा जुषेथाम् ।.

In these passages, old and new songs or prayers are spoken of. From these allusions, it is quite evident that the hymns of the Ṛigveda were composed by different generations of sages, and that they extended over a long period of time.

When we have once admitted the fact that the ten Maṇḍalas of the Ṛigveda have gathered up the work of many periods and that the original composition of the hymns was probably the work of several centuries, then we can discover several criteria by which to distinguish earlier from later hymns. I shall here briefly notice only some of them.

First is the criterion of grammar and language. It has been found by a searching scrutiny of the particular gramatical forms in the Veda that certain forms are more frequently found in earlier hymns. I shall notice some of them here.

1 From nouns in अ, the Instrumental Singular mas. or neuter in आ—*e. g.* यज्ञा I. 168-1a, हिमा X. 37-10 b, उक्था IV. 33-10 a and so on.

2 Old declensional forms from radical stems in आ e. g. धियंधे, शुचिपे, ऋष्टिप्रः, जास्पत्या and so on.

3 The Instrumental sing. in ई—e. g. आचित्ती, अप्रभूती, ऊती, प्रभूती, शमी, श्रुष्टी, हस्तच्युती and so on.

4 The neuter plural in ऊ, e. g. उरू त्रिधातू, वसू, वीळू सुहन्तू, and so on.

5 The vocatives in वः and मः from stems in वन्त and मन्त ; e. g. अद्रिवः, सहस्वः, स्वधावः, हरिवः हविष्मः and so on.

6 The forms मह्य, तुभ्य, अस्मभ्य, sometimes found in the text in Sandhi combination, to be restored in accordance with the metre—e. g. VII. 29. 1 a तुभ्य (required by the metre), VII. 32-21 c; VII. 90-2 b; अस्मभ्य VII. 74-5 d ; VII. 78-1 d ; VII. 79-4 a ; VII. 81-6 b.

7 Unaugmented forms of historical tenses—e. g. तक्षत्, दुद्रवत, प्रथिष्ट, भरत, भुवत ; etc.

8 All forms of the Perfect Subjunctive Active—e. g. चिकितः, जुजोषः, ततनः, दीदयः, दधर्षत, मामहः, मुमुचः, etc.

9 Perfect participles without reduplication except विद्वांस्—e. g. खिद्वांस्, दाश्वांस्, मीळ्हवांस्, and साह्वांस्.

10 Forms of the 2nd per. dual and plural of the root-Aorist, having strong stems—e. g. कर्तम, कर्त, कर्तन, गन्तम्, धात, धातन.

11 The Aorist Imperative forms in सि—कर्षि, जेषि, दार्शि, धक्षि, नेषि, भक्षि, यक्षि, वाक्षि, etc.

12 The Aorist Imperative form बोधि, whether from बुध् or भू.

13 The middle participle in सान from the स् Aorist—अर्चसान, ऋञ्जसान, मन्दसान, महसान.

14 The infinitives in तये and their derivatives—e. g. इष्टये, हव्यदातये, पीतये (पूर्व—or सोम—), वीतये, सातये (वाज—).

15 The infinitives in ध्यै.
16 The infinitives in वने—*e. g.* दावने, etc.
17 The infinitives in से or असे-अर्चसे, ऋचसे, ऋञ्जसे.
18 The pronoun स्य, त्य.

The following words are characteristic of the earlier portion of the Ṛigveda--

अक्तु—'beam'; अत्य—'swift'; अद्रि and its compounds; आभिष्टि—'help', and its compounds; अवः and its derivatives like अवस्यु etc.; ऋजीषिन्—'direct'; क्षिति—'dwelling'; चनः—'delight' and चनस्य, चानिष्ठ etc.; चर्षणि—'mortal'—and its compounds with root nouns *e. g.* चर्षणिधृत etc.; compounds ending with चन्द्र-अश्वचन्द्र, पुरुचन्द्र, etc.;—the verb and adj. तुज्; compounds ending in तुर् 'conquering, *e. g.* रथतुर्, सुप्रतुर् etc.; compounds beginning with तुवि-*e. g.* तुविजात, तुविदेष्ण etc.; दंस् 'to excel'—दंसन, दंसः, दंसिष्ठ पुरुदंसस्, सुदंसस् etc.; so also दस्म, दस्र; दुवः; देवताति; मन्द्र with compounds; मन्मन 'thought' with compounds; वाज 'prize' and compounds; विप्र—'a poet'; श्रवः 'glory'.

On the other hand words connected with disease, magic and popular belief, so also technical terms chiefly of ritual and philosophy are characteristic of the later parts of the Ṛigveda which are allied to the Atharvaveda.

Certain peculiarities of Sandhi also may be pointed out as characteristic of the earlier or proper Ṛigveda. Thus we find that very generally, final अ and आ are regularly combined with an initial vowel or diphthong following; and final इ, ई, उ, ऊ are regularly combined with similar vowels. But before dissimilar vowels they are regularly used with hiatus, except perhaps in

the case of dissyllabic prepositions followed by the augmented tenses of the verbs to which they belong.

So also words ending in अः, ए, ओ lose their final element, before an initial vowel following, and are therefore all alike treated as ending in अ with hiatus; and similarly words ending in ऐ and औ are treated as ending in आ. But duals both of nouns and of verbs ending in ए are unaltered.

According to the rules of classical Sanskrit, final अः becomes ओ and final ए is unaltered, if the next word begins with अ, but the initial अ is lost. This Sandhi is comparatively rare in the Ṛigveda proper or its earlier part, but is considerably common in the later portions. We find on the whole that a hiatus is more common than the combinations, though we have instances where Sandhi takes place in position in which it never takes place in classical Sanskrit *e. g.* in the case of duals ending in आ, ई and ऊ, especially when followed by इव.

Secondly, we have the criterion of metre. The metres which are combinations of eight-syallabled and eleven or twelve--syllabled feet like उष्णिह्, ककुभ्, बृहती, सतोबृहती and अत्यष्टि, which are practically unknown in later literature may be presumed to belong to the more distinctively early parts of the Ṛigveda. The Vedic Anushṭubh can be also easily marked from the later or epic Anushṭubh. Here I give two verses representing the two kinds of अनुष्टुभ्.—Vedic Anushṭubh—I. 11. 5.

त्वं वलस्य गोमत अपावरद्रिवो बिलम्।
त्वां देवा अबिभ्युषः तुज्यमानास आविषुः॥

Epic Anushṭubh—X. 136. 7.

वायुरस्मा उपामन्थत् पिनाष्टि स्मा कुनन्नमा ।
केशी विषस्य पात्रेण यद् रुद्रेणापिबत् सह ॥

which, as we see, is very similar to the अनुष्टुभ् of Bhárata and Rámáyaṇa.

Another criterion for the same is the occurrence of a Ṛigveda hymn in the Atharvaveda. If a complete hymn or a fragment or even any part of it beyond one stanza is repeated in the Atharvaveda, it is a strong indication of the later character of that hymn. Thus for instance VII. 55, 5—8; VII. 59. 12;. VII. 104.

There is last of all the criterion of subject matter. Broadly speaking the Ṛigveda hymns may be divided into two classes, religious and secular. Of course, a very large majority of the hymns belongs to the first class, while those belonging to the second class are comparatively few. The great majority of hymns are invocations and adorations of the gods therein addressed, whose keynote is a simple outpouring of the heart, a prayer to the eternals, an invitation to them to accept favourably the gift reverently consecrated.

On the other hand there are other hymns containing references to the details of ritual, the particular kinds of priests and their functions, which show a general tendency to deify everything connected with sacrifice. Such hymns clearly mark a later stage as compared with the hymns described in the last paragraph. Briefly speaking hymns belonging to the earlier parts of Ṛigveda are prevailingly characterised by the following ideas, of which simplicity of worship is the most prominent. The kindling of the sacred fire before dawn as if to ensure the return of day-

light and the preparation of the sacred drink and poetic inspiration, it is these three ideas that are the dominant features of the early Ṛigveda. Agni and Indra are the principal deities, the former is the homely priest and the messenger between men and gods; the latter is the physical god, warlike in spirit who broke asunder the clouds and brought down rain. On the other hand, the idea of addressing विश्वेदेवाः marks a later stage. So also the deification of prayer, of the doors of the sacrificial chamber, of the kuśa grass and so on, all this belongs to the later parts of the Ṛigveda.

So also दानस्तुतिs or hymns in praise of the liberal donations from patrons and princes to priests necessarily pre-suppose a fully elaborated ritual and the establishment of the practice of having hired priests to whom fees were paid.

So also hymns which are philosophical in character, asking such questions as whence we come, who we are, where we go, no longer satisfied with the conception that such and such a god created heaven and earth etc. are distinctly later in character and mark the period of transition from the Mantras to the Bráhmaṇas.

So also poetic riddles and satirical hymns belong to the later period. Hymns containing references to magic and exorcism and charms, which are distinctly allied to the contents of the Atharvaveda in character as also didactic hymns mark a later stage. In a word, all those passages which record for us, as it were, the first distinctively Indian efforts to lay the foundations of philosophy, astrology and magic are to be looked upon as later in character.

Ṛigveda is full of myths but they are boldly related in the early hymns of the Ṛigveda, generally in single stanzas; as for instance, the warlike deeds of Indra and the clever resources and cures of the Aśvins. But in the later hymns of the Ṛigveda, the myths appear in a dramatic form, and the theme is not historical but social. The dialogue between Purûravas and Urvaśí X. 95, the tale of Agastya and Lopámudrá I. 179, and the tale of Yama and Yamí, the parents of the human race X. 10, may be cited as instances. In such hymns, the poets for the first time wrestle with the moral and æsthetic problems associated with the relationship of man to woman. The idea that the woman is the temptress, there is no truth in the friendship of women, they have the hearts of hyænas which so conspicuously prevails in later Sanskrit literature has its germs in these later portions of Ṛigveda. So also we have here the germs of the ascetic theories which afterwards became the conspicuous features of Brahmanism and Buddhism.

LECTURE IV.

THE WORK DONE BY MODERN SCHOLARS

(In the field of the Study of Rigveda).

—— :0: ——

The advance of oriental studies—1784, the Asiatic Society of Bengal—Colebrooke—Friedrich Rosen—Roth, the founder of modern Vedic studies—St. Petersburg Lexicon—Weber—Max Müller—His sympathetic and liberalising spirit—Ancient Sanskrit Literature—Muir's Original Sanskrit Texts—Haug's Aitareya Brâhmaṇa—Translations of the Rigveda—Wilson, Grassmann and Ludwig—Kaegi's Rigveda—Vedische Studien by Geldner and Pischel—Whitney's Grammar—Oldenberg's notes on Rigveda-Concordance and Index—Pandit's Vedârthayatna—Mr. Tilak's two books—Srutibodha.

In the course of the last two lectures, I hope to have succeeded in giving you a general idea of the literature known as Veda and of the Ṛigveda in particular. Now I should proceed to speak on the method of studying Ṛigveda and on the principles which should guide that study. But before doing that I believe it would be useful and interesting too, to know what has been done in the field of the study of the Ṛigveda by modern scholars as well as by the ancients. Nay, even it is necessary for a student of Ṛigveda to know the amount and quality of the work done in the direction, without having a general view of which he

can not confidently and critically proceed with the study.

One of the many benefits conferred by the British rule in India, is the revival of oriental learning-especially of Sanskrit learning on modern and critical lines, and its introduction into Europe. The important place which Sanskrit holds at present not only in the Indian Universities but in most of the prominent European Universities also is the result of the sympathy of our rulers with ancient learning. Sanskrit learning in almost all its branches has been zealously cultivated by European scholars. (Critical editions of texts, reviews, fixing the chronology of works and authors, the study of old inscriptions, the collection of old MSS., these and many more have been the several aspects of the manifold activity in the field of Sanskrit study.) But nothing exceeds the work done in the field of Vedic study in particular, especially that done in Germany, which, to our great surprise, in this respect, is far ahead of England. It is a matter of still greater surprise that whereas there is not a single complete translation of the Ṛigveda Saṁhitâ in any of the Indian vernaculars, there are two such in German and two in English, not to speak of the many commentaries and studies bearing on Ṛigveda in these two languages. It is the German language which has the honour of having a dictionary of the Sanskrit language on historic and comparative principles–a dictionary, a like of which no other classical language can boast of. And it must be remembered that a European scholar is generally free from the orthodox prejudices and the excessive patriotism re-

sulting therefrom which sometimes hamper proper critical work on the part of an Indian scholar for whom it is very difficult to get rid of their influence. So also there are certain inevitable faults which characterise the work of European scholars, owing to their remote distance in spirit and tradition from the Indian point of view. Of this more later on. In the meanwhile I intend to take a brief survey, very brief indeed, of the work done by European scholars in the field of the study of Ṛigveda in particular. No completeness is attempted and any important omissions may be excused.

It was about the middle of the 18th century that the great French writer Voltaire, in his 'Essai Sur les Moers et L'esprit des Nations' highly praised the ancient wisdom of the Brâhmaṇas which he discovered in the Ezour-veidam, which was afterwards proved to be a forgery by some missionary of the name of Robertus de Nobilitus. It was not till the year 1784, that the study of Indian ancient learning was based on a firm foundation, the year when the Asiatic Society of Bengal was founded. The following year saw a translation of the Bhagavad-Gītā, by Wilkins. The year 1805, however, marked an epoch in the course of Vedic studies when Colebrooke contributed to the Asiatic Researches his paper "on the Vedas, the sacred writings of the Hindus". The paper is a lengthy survey of the whole of the Vedic literature extending over more than a hundred quarter pages, which may be read with advantage even to-day, and which does high credit to the author, especially when we take into consideration the state

of Sanskrit learning in his day, and clearly shows his grasp and accuracy. It would be interesting to read the conclusion of his essay, especially in the light of the present day condition of Vedic studies. "The preceding description," says he "may serve to convey some notion of the Vedas. They are too voluminous for a complete translation of the whole; and what they contain would hardly reward the labour of the reader, much less that of the translator. The ancient dialect in which they are composed and especially that of the three first Vedas, is extremely difficult and obscure and, though curious, as the parent of a more polished and refined language (the classical Sanskrit), its difficulties must long continue to prevent such an examination of the whole Vedas, as would be requisite for extracting all that is remarkable and important in these voluminous works. But they well deserve to be occasionally consulted by the oriental scholars." * How far this judgment has turned out to be correct, I leave to you to judge. I have specially to recommend Colebrooke's instance to you, young students of Ṛigveda, because this oriental scholar had at first a strong disgust for oriental learning, of which he was cured by no other antidote than the study itself of that learning. Do remember, my young friends, that he who once styled Wilkins, the translator of Bhagavad Gītā, "Sanskrit-mad"§ and the Asiatic Miscellany, "a repository of nonsense", and the Institutes of Akbar, "a dung-hill in which, perhaps,

---

* Colebrooke's Essays Vol. I. p. 113.

§ Colebrooke's Essays Vol. I. Memoir pp. VII, VIII.

a pearl or two might be found," became afterwards such a zealous orientalist, the first to light the torch of Vedic studies.

About twenty years later, a German, Friedrich Rosen, recognized the true worth of this Vedic literature in the rich collection of Vedic MSS. mostly made available through the efforts of Colebrooke. He undertook with zeal the editing of the oldest work viz. the Ṛigveda, but died in 1837 before the first eighth was published, as "Ṛigveda Saṁhitā, liber primus, Sanskrite et latine 1838".

It was in the year 1846, that a real, enduring impulse was given to the study of Veda, which saw the small but epoch-making work by Rudolph Roth,—'Zur Literature and Geschichte des Veda'. "It inaugurated a movement which since then has irresistibly led all Sanskritists to the Veda."* This Roth occupies a unique position in the history of the Vedic studies. He gave an absolutely new turn to its course and is regarded as the founder, as it were, of the inductive and historial method, in that domain. The St. Petersburgh Sanskrit-German Lexicon in 7 volumes, marks an era and amply testifies to the indefatigable zeal and industry of Roth and Bœthlingk. In this stupendous dictionary every word is traced from the oldest to the latest work of literature, from the Rigveda down to classical literature, and the different meanings classified which the word possesses at different stages of its existence. All the passages where a word occurs have been brought together and

* 'Rigveda' by Kaegi, p. 2.

thence by comparison its meaning is fixed. In this dictionary, of which Sanskrit must be very proud, we can, as it were, see the history of every word from the period when the Aryans first settled themselves in the land of the seven rivers, to the period which saw the bloom of the most elaborate and artificial classical literature. Almost all works then available have been drawn upon. No student of Ṛigveda can do without this dictionary in which an article, as it were, has been devoted to about every important word. The Vedic part was taken up by Roth, whereas the post-Vedic was taken up by Bœthlingk.

Next came A. Weber, another great German Orientalist, who gave a detailed and valuable survey of the Vedic books, in his "Academische Vorlesungen über Indische Literature geschichte" 1852. His 'Indische Studien' is a remarkable repository of oriental learning in all its branches, Veda, philosophy, grammar, lexicography and so on; and though the conclusions at which he arrived may be sometimes wrong still the work done and its extent and the author's versatility cannot but fill us with wonder and admiration. His 'History of Sanskrit Literature' translated into English is well-known to the Sanskrit students at the B. A.

From Weber we pass on to another genius, the highest in the field of oriental learning of our time, I mean, Max Müller, whose name will be ever remembered by Sanskrit students. A man of wonderfully versatile genius, he has written numbers of volumes on almost all the branches of the oriental learning, Vedic exegesis, comparative philology comparative mythology,

philosophy, grammar and so on. His lecture-system, and the lucid flow of language which generally characterises his writings, has contributed to popularise Sanskrit learning; but above all, what stands foremost in his writings is the sympathising spirit with which he is actuated. No literature can be properly studied or understood or criticised unless you first read it with sympathy ; and this sympathy is the most conspicuous trait of Max Müller's. Here I may quote what Prof. Bloomfield says of him* "The Hindus called him Mokshamúlara, during his latter days. It happens that Moksha is the Sanskrit word for 'Salvation' and Múla means 'root'. To the Hindus his name means 'Root-of-Salvation', or as we might say, with a different turn, 'Salvation Müller.' I do not imagine that Müller believed in the Hindu salvation, which is release from the chain of lives and deaths in the course of transmigration. But if freedom of mind partakes of the flavour of Salvation, 'Salvation Müller' he was. Max Müller's eminence as a scholar and writer is well-known to you; less generally well understood, perhaps, is the liberalising quality of his thought, which he exercised untiringly during more than half a century. Among Europeans he was pre-eminent for the spirit of sympathy and fairness which he brought to the study and criticism of Hindu religious thought."

Is it not very curious indeed that the *editio prinseps* of the whole of Ṛigveda Saṁhitâ, the oldest and the most highly valued work of the Hindus, with the

---

* 'Religion of the Veda'—Bloomfield. p. 54.

commentary of Sâyaṇa should have been edited in England by a German Professor ? Yet it is quite in keeping with the phenomenon of the destinies of millions of Hindus being entrusted to the care of Englishmen so far removed from each other, not only in distance but in spirit, and temperament, customs and habits. However, there is nothing strange in all this when we remember the fact that we all come from the same Indo-European stock, as has been proved now conclusively on grounds of comparative philology and comparative mythology. This edition of Ṛigveda placed the Vedic studies on a firm foundation, and since its appearance, they have progressed with wonderful rapidity. 'Ancient Sanskrit Literature' is another monumental work, in which Max Müller takes a detailed survey of the Vedic literature, and it is an authority even to this day, notwithstanding the mass of new information brought to hand since then. Of course we may not agree with the learned scholar in all his conclusions, for many of which his highly poetic temperament was responsible, as for instance, his estimate of the contents of the Ṛigveda and its age ; still the book has rendered valuable service to the cause of Vedic studies by the detailed information it gives in a systematic and interesting manner. Towards the interpretation of the Ṛigveda text also, he has made many contributions.

Next is to be mentioned 'the Original Sanskrit Texts' by Muir in 5 volumes. Nothing can surpass the industry and grasp of this scholar, the wide range of literature which he draws upon, the marshalling of facts and

the deducing of conclusions therefrom. These volumes are a repository of learning to the Sanskrit student who will find therein all important passages, with their translation into English, from Ṛigveda down to Purâṇas and epics, bearing on any particular idea, followed by the views of different eminent scholars on the same. To quote the author's own words*. "In treating the several topics...I propose in each case, to adduce, first any texts bearing upon it, which may be found in the hymns of the Ṛigveda ; next, those in the Brâhmaṇas, and their appendages, and lastly, those occuring in any of the different classes of works coming under the designation of Smṛiti. (It is to be remembered here that the term Smṛiti, according to Muir, includes (1) the Vedâṅgas such as Nirukta, (2) the Sútras or aphorisms, Srauta and Gṛihya, (3) Institutes of Manu and (4) The Itihâsas and Purâṇas.) By this means we shall learn what conceptions or opinions were entertained on each subject by the oldest Indian authors, and what were the various modifications to which these ideas were subjected by their successors." The topics treated are very various ; e. g. the origin of the four castes, the mutual relation of Brahmans and Kshatriyas, affinities of the Indians with the Persians, Greeks and Romans, on the evidence of language, the origin and authority of the Vedas, Indian Mythology, society and life in the Vedic age and so on. I have no hesitation in recommending these books strongly to every student of Ṛigveda especially as they teach

---

* Muir's Original Sanskrit Texts Vol. I. p. 6.

us the method of collecting together facts, critically reviewing them and drawing conclusions therefrom, without at the same time causing us the trouble of finding out references, all the texts in question being fully quoted in their original form.

Dr. Haug's edition of Aitareya Brâhmaṇa deserves a mention here, especially on account of the nice and informing introduction affixed to it, though his view that Yajurveda must be older in character than Ṛigveda has not secured many followers.

Here is the place to mention the several translations of the Ṛigveda. The oldest is that by Wilson whose name must be remembered in the domain of Sanskrit Scholarship. Wilson's Hindu Theatre and translation of Vishṇupurâṇa are too well-known to be mentioned here. And we have nothing to do with them here. His translation of Ṛigveda is the first attempt of its kind, highly useful in his day, though its value today is much marred. The difficulties in his way were, no doubt, insurmountable, out of regard for the condition of Vedic studies in his times. Wilson was of opinion that the sacred books of the Hindus can be best interpreted by him who has imbibed the Indian spirit; that the native commentators were best qualified for the task and that a foreigner notwithstanding his impartiality and desire to know the truth is very likely to carry his own prejudices into his work, which may be opposed to the spirit of the original. Thus he thought that in the absence of any better Indian commentary, Sâyaṇa's commentary on the Ṛigveda was the best interpretation, more correct than any coming from a

European scholar. Hence he translated the hymns of the Ṛigveda just as they were interpreted by Sâyaṇa. Thus the translation though useful in its own way, especially for understanding Sâyaṇa where he is obscure or ambiguous, has lost much of its authority in the light of the later researches in the field of Vedic study.

Two German translations of Ṛigveda by Ludwig and Grassmann deserve to be noticed here, the former being prose and the latter being metrical. Both these scholars had a gigantic task before them, which they have creditably succeeded in performing. No doubt many times they propose fanciful interpretations, and they are very readily prone to effect amendations and alterations, which are sometimes not only unnecessary but absolutely wrong, and shocking. They proceed with the belief that native interpretations are as a rule bound to be wrong and uncritical, and their impatience to apply the so-called historical and critical method has sometimes landed them into curious conclusions. We can not follow the translations wholesale though they are clearly pervaded by the spirit of criticism.

Grassmann's Dictionary of the Ṛigveda (Sanskrit-German) published in 1873–75 is a very useful little book which every student of Rigveda should be in possession of. Herein under every word he gives all the passages without exception in the ten books of the Ṛigveda, where the word occurs, classifying them according to the different stages of meaning which the word in question passes through.

Kaegi's essay on the Ṛigveda (1880) also translated into English, is a model essay briefly surveying the

contents of the Ṛigveda and extending over a hundred pages (quarto). It is written in a very lucid style and the tone throughout is sober and reasonable.

Vedische Studien in three volumes by Geldner and Pischel are direct contributions to the Vedic exegesis. They are the fruit of the long-continued study of the Veda by the authors, and the method of study can be best learnt therefrom. Most of the important words in the Ṛigveda hymns, whose meaning is obscure or doubtful or about which scholars differ, have been taken up for discussion and traced through not only Vedic passages but also through works allied thereto. Some important hymns have been selected for study. They have been translated and notes on words and syntax have been copiously added, thus actually showing how you arrive at the particular translation. Some interesting legends like that of Urvaśí and Purúravas have been traced historically. In brief, the book is such as a student of Ṛigveda can never dispense with. The authors are sane critics avoiding either extreme, neither too orthodox nor too rationalistic, giving due credit to Sáyaṇa where he is quite right and generally recognizing the value of his contributions to Vedic interpretation.

Here I may mention also Whitney's grammar, which was the first to take cognizance of the Vedic idiom along with the classical. All other grammars only dealt with the classical Sanskrit; but Whitney attempted to treat the language and the grammatical forms historically. Thus in every chapter or department of grammar he mentions the forms which a particular

inflexion shows in Ṛigveda, the Bráhmaṇas and works allied thereto. Thus, for instance, if you look to the declension of words ending in अ, you will find that immediately below the classical forms, the Vedic forms like देवासः, देवेभिः, युगा etc. are mentioned. The chapters on accent are also very useful. Thus Whitney's grammar serves a purpose which cannot be served by any other book available up to now.

Prof. Oldenberg, a great Vedic scholar, has laid the Vedic student under great obligations by his regular commentary on the whole of the Ṛigveda Saṁhitá very recently published in two volumes. Therein, he takes for consideration every hymn, and deals with all peculiarities, metrical, grammatical exegetical and so on, generally introducing them with some general remarks where necessary regarding the relation of the hymn to others or any particular traits which may be worth noting. What renders the work highly useful is the copious references to other treatises dealing with Ṛigveda, in German, French and English. Thus in brief, in Oldenberg's commentary, we have presented to us in one place, all that has been said on a particular verse of the Ṛigveda or any particular word of interest therein.

Much more has been done by way of papers and contributions, dealing with particular topics connected with the Vedic exegesis, for which you will have to refer to the numbers of the journals of the German Oriental Society, the American Oriental Society, and the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. I may mention amongst others, such treatises as Prof.

Lanman's Noun Inflection in the Veda, Dr. Arnold's Vedic Metre and Bloomfield's American Lectures on the Religion of the Veda.

In a new field of study like the Vedic exegesis, much plodding work has to be done in the beginning without which the progress of students is very much hampered. Thus Bloomfield's Concordance to Ṛigveda, the very recently published Vedic Index by Prof. Macdonel and Dr. Keith, are works of this character, clearly testifying to the patience and perseverance of European scholars.

Coming over to India, we may mention an attempt to interpret Ṛigveda on modern lines by the late S. P. Pandit, who in his Vedârthayatna, attempted to begin a rational interpretation of the text, with translations in Marathi and English, supplemented with notes explanatory and critical. The attempt was very promising, indeed, but scarcely had Pandit proceeded as far as the 3rd Maṇḍala when he was suddenly carried away by the hands of death, and the work thus interrupted by Pandit's premature death, has not been taken up by any one.

Mr. Tilak's two books 'The Orion,' and 'The Arctic Home in the Vedas' have been original contributions to Vedic criticism, characterised as they are by a sobriety of judgment and a spirit of right criticism. In the former Mr. Tilak tries to prove on astronomical grounds that the date of Ṛigveda must be pushed back thousands of years and that it is not possible to acquiesce in the early date fixed by European scholars. In the latter, he tries to refute the current theory about the original

abode of the Aryans, who he thinks must have been inhabitants of the regions about the North Pole. I may here mention श्रुतिबोध which gives translations of Rig-veda in English and the several vernaculars of India. Though it is serving a useful purpose by making the contents of our most sacred and ancient book accessible to the masses, still to the Vedic student as such, it is of no great value.

LECTURE V.

THE WORK DONE BY THE ANCIENTS

In the field of the Study of Rigveda.

—:o:—

Explanatory passages in the Bráhmaṇas—Prátiśákhyas—Nirukta of Yáska—The discussion about the meaninglessness of Mantras—The estimate of Yáska's service—Several explanations of one and the same word or passage—The Nairuktas—The Aitihásikas—The Yájñikas—The Naidánas—Mere faith without reasoning, not sufficient for interpretation—The work of Mimánsakas—The Vedárthaprakáśa of Sáyaṇácbárya—The theological bias—no continuity of tradition—occasional misunderstanding of the Vedic spirit—The invaluable service rendered by Sáyaṇa.

Next we have to consider the work done by the Ancients in the field of Vedic exegesis. If we go over the Brâhmaṇas, which themselves form a part of the sacred canonical works, and bring together all those passages which contain explanations of Saṁhitâ texts or derivations of words, of course, not for their own sake but for purpose of eulogising the particular act of the ritual or for elucidating, so to say, the mystic relation between the act and the Mantra which accompanies it, we shall have before us a large mass of material, which serves as contributions to the Vedic interpretation. Even to critical European scholars, such explanatory references found in the Brâhmaṇas have proved of use to determine the meanings of words which are otherwise ambiguous and defy all attempts at explanation.

The Prâtiśâkhya works noticed above (in Lecture 2), are also attempts in the same direction, though they relate more to the text and orthography than to the regular interpretation. Works like the Sarvânukramaṇî of Kâtyâyana and the Brihaddevata are important from the point of view of the preservation of the text, only indirectly serving the purpose of Vedic interpretation.

First and foremost as a direct attempt to interpret the Vedic texts, stands the Nirukta of Yâska, than which no older work of the type is known to-day. Of course, it is to be remembered that even this old work must have been far removed in age and spirit from the period of the Saṁhitâs, as appears from the fact that Yáska often makes a two-fold distinction, while explaining the meanings of words. Thus, for instance, in the section on निपातs, he remarks thus*-' इवेति भाषायञ्च अन्वध्यायञ्च । अग्निरिवेन्द्र इवेति । नेति प्रतिषेधार्थीयो भाषायाम् । उभयमन्वध्यायम्.' 'इव shows comparison both in the ordinary language of intercourse and in the Scriptures. न is a particle of negation in the language, but means both negation and comparison in the Scriptures.' Here the distinction of the language of the scriptures or the Vedas (including both Saṁhitâs and Brâhmaṇas) and the language of intercourse in vogue at the time, is clearly meant. The language of the day must have essentially differed from the Vedic language, in order to justify the necessity of such references. But the same fact is proved beyond doubt by the discussion regarding the question whether the Mantras are pos-

* Nirukta I. 4.

sessed of a meaning or not. On account of its great interest, I can not forbear quoting it here in full :—*
"Now, without this work, the meaning of the hymns can not be understood; but he who does not comprehend their meaning can not thoroughly know their accentuation and grammatical forms. Therefore, this department of science is the complement of grammar, and an instrument for gaining one's own object." Then steps forth Kautsa who proceeds to object thus. "If this Nirukta or the science of interpretation is intended to make the sense of the Mantras clear, it is useless, for the Mantras have no sense. This is to be considered as follows :—

(1) The statements (in the hymns and texts) have certain fixed words, and a certain fixed arrangement.

(2) The Mantras are endowed with their forms by the Brâhmaṇas ; thus :—'Spread thyself widely out 'उरुप्रथा उरु प्रथस्वोरु ते यज्ञपतिः प्रथताम्' वाजस. सं. I. 22—and so he spreads—उरुप्रथस्वेति प्रथयति (शतपथ. ब्रा० 1, 3, 6, 8).

(3) They prescribe what is impracticable : thus— 'deliver him, oh plant' :—'Axe, do not injure him'—thus he speaks while striking.

(4) Their contents are at variance with each other :—thus—'There exists but one Rudra, and no second ;' And again 'there are innumerable, thousands of Rudras over the earth ;' so also—'Indra, thou hast been born without a foe' and again 'Indra vanquished a hundred armies at once.'

---

* Nirukta I. 15.

(5) A person is enjoined to do an act with which he is already acquainted : Thus "address the hymn to the fire which is being kindled"—(This is said by the Adhvaryu priest to the Hotṛi.)

(6) Again it is said—Aditi is everything, 'Aditi is the Sky,' 'Aditi is the atmosphere'.

(7) The signification of the Mantras is indistinct, as in the case of such words as अम्यक् (Ṛig. I. 16.93), यादृश्मिन् (Ṛig., V. 44-8.), जारयायि (Ṛig., VI. 12-4), काणुका (Ṛig., VIII. 66-4)."

To all these objections raised by Kautsa, Yâska replies as follows—"The Mantras have a sense, for their words are the same (as those in the ordinary language). A Brâhmaṇa says (Aitareya I. 4), 'what is appropriate in its form, is successful in the sacrifice': that is to say, when the verse, ऋच् or यजुष्, which is recited refers to the ceremony which is being performed. (An example of the identity of the Vedic language with ordinary speech is this—'क्रीळन्तौ etc.' (sporting sons and grandsons).

1. As for the argument about the fixity of words and their arrangement, this is the case in ordinary language also., *e. g.* इन्द्राग्नी, पितापुत्रौ &c.

2. As for the Mantras being endowed with their form by a Brâhmaṇa, the Brâhmaṇa is a mere repetition of what has been already said in the Mantras.

3. As for the prescribing of something impracticable, it depends on the statements of the Scriptures, whether an act is हिंसा or अहिंसा.

4. As for the contents of the Mantras being at variance, the same thing occurs in ordinary language

sessed of a meaning or not. On account of its great interest, I can not forbear quoting it here in full :—*
"Now, without this work, the meaning of the hymns can not be understood; but he who does not comprehend their meaning can not thoroughly know their accentuation and grammatical forms. Therefore, this department of science is the complement of grammar, and an instrument for gaining one's own object." Then steps forth Kautsa who proceeds to object thus. "If this Nirukta or the science of interpretation is intended to make the sense of the Mantras clear, it is useless, for the Mantras have no sense. This is to be considered as follows :—

(1) The statements (in the hymns and texts) have certain fixed words, and a certain fixed arrangement.

(2) The Mantras are endowed with their forms by the Brâhmaṇas ; thus :—'Spread thyself widely out 'उरुप्रथा उरु प्रथस्वोरु ते यज्ञपतिः प्रथताम्' वाजस. सं. I. 22—and so he spreads—उरुप्रथस्वेति प्रथयाति (शतपथ. ब्रा० 1, 3, 6, 8).

(3) They prescribe what is impracticable: thus—'deliver him, oh plant':—'Axe, do not injure him'—thus he speaks while striking.

(4) Their contents are at variance with each other :—thus—'There exists but one Rudra, and no second;' And again 'there are innumerable, thousands of Rudras over the earth;' so also—'Indra, thou hast been born without a foe' and again 'Indra vanquished a hundred armies at once.'

---

* Nirukta I. 15.

(5) A person is enjoined to do an act with which he is already acquainted : Thus "address the hymn to the fire which is being kindled"—(This is said by the Adhvaryu priest to the Hotṛi.)

(6) Again it is said—Aditi is everything, 'Aditi is the Sky,' 'Aditi is the atmosphere'.

(7) The signification of the Mantras is indistinct, as in the case of such words as अम्यक् (Ṛig. I. 16.93), यादृश्मिन् (Ṛig., V. 44-8.), जारयायि (Ṛig., VI. 12-4), काणुका (Ṛig., VIII. 66-4)."

To all these objections raised by Kautsa, Yâska replies as follows—"The Mantras have a sense, for their words are the same (as those in the ordinary language). A Brâhmaṇa says (Aitareya I. 4), 'what is appropriate in its form, is successful in the sacrifice': that is to say, when the verse, ऋच् or यजुष्, which is recited refers to the ceremony which is being performed. (An example of the identity of the Vedic language with ordinary speech is this—'क्रीळन्तौ etc.' (sporting sons and grandsons).

1. As for the argument about the fixity of words and their arrangement, this is the case in ordinary language also., *e. g.* इन्द्राग्नी, पितापुत्रौ &c.

2. As for the Mantras being endowed with their form by a Brâhmaṇa, the Brâhmaṇa is a mere repetition of what has been already said in the Mantras.

3. As for the prescribing of something impracticable, it depends on the statements of the Scriptures, whether an act is हिंसा or अहिंसा.

4. As for the contents of the Mantras being at variance, the same thing occurs in ordinary language

also; thus—'this Brâhmaṇa is without a rival', 'The King has no enemies'.

5. As for the enjoining of something with which a man is already acquainted, people are in the same way saluted by their names, though they already know them; and the मधुपर्क (a dish of curds, ghee and honey) is mentioned to those who are well acquainted with the same.

6. As for the statement 'Aditi is everything', the same thing is said in common language also; thus—'All fluids or flavours reside in water.'

7. As for the indistinct signification, it is not the fault of the post, that the blind man does not see it. It is the man's fault. Just as in respect of local usages, men are distinguished by superior knowledge, so, too, among those learned men who are skilled in tradition, he who knows most is worthy of approbation."

From this discussion, it is quite evident that in the days of Yâska, the meaning of the Mantras had become obscure; what is more is that such questions as whether the Mantras are meaningless or not were boldly raised and discussed, although कौत्स may be merely a man of straw viewed as a fictitious Devadatta, used as a device only to teach more impressively, as the commentator Durga understands, or some real Ṛishi representing some school like other निरुक्तकारs referred to by Yâska, as European scholars conjecture.

The very fact of the existence of the original निघण्टु on which the निरुक्त is a commentary points to the conclusion that the sense of many of the Vedic words had been commonly forgotton. For, what occasion was

there for compiling vocabularies of Vedic words, if the sense of these words had continued all along familiar to the students of the Vedas? The same thing is also clear from many passages in Yáska's work, in which he attempts to explain Vedic words by their etymologies (a process often tentative, which would have been unnecessary if their meanings had been perfectly known), or in which he cites the opinions of different classes of interpreters who had preceded him, and who had severally propounded different explanations.

Whether there was any regular tradition of Vedic interpretation preserved through all this period which must have elapsed between the Mantras and Bráhmaṇas on the one hand and the Nirukta on the other hand, it is very difficult to decide in the present condition of Vedic learning. Though the Indian commentators like Yáska may not be regarded as infallible, still they can not be altogether set aside, as the help they render is simply invaluable. They are not merely frenzied persons propounding fancied interpretations without the slightest show of authority.

I quote here Roth's remarks in this connection :—

"Vedic interpretation could impose on itself no greater obstruction than to imagine that the Indian commentators were infallible, or that they had inherited traditions which were of any value. Even a superficial examination shows that their plan of interpretation is the very opposite of traditional, that it is in reality, a grammatical and etymological one, which only agrees with the former method in the erroneous system of explaining every

verse, every line, every word by itself, without inquring if the results so obtained harmonize with those derived from other quarters. If the fact that none of the commentators are in possession of anything more than a very simple set of conceptions regarding *e. g.* the functions of a particular god, or even the entire contents of the hymns which they are continually intruding into their interpretations, be regarded as a proof of their having inherited a tradition, it will at least be admitted that this poverty of ideas is not a thing which we have any reason to covet. In this set of conceptions are included those scholastis ideas which were introduced at an early period, indeed, but not until the hymns had already become the subject of learned study, and the religious views and social circumstances on which they are based had lost all living reality.........What is true of Sâyaṇa, or any of the other later commentators, applies essentially to Yâska also. He, too, is a learned interpreter who works with the materials which his predecessors had collected, but he possesses an incalculable advantage, in point of time over those compilers of detailed and continuous commentaries and belongs to a quite different literary period; viz. to that when Sanskrit was still undergoing a process of natural growth."

I am not prepared to go so far as to assert that Yâska's explanations are altogether without the basis of tradition. Although there are several instances where the derivations proposed appear to be fanciful, still in a large number of cases, Yâska's remarks are followed by 'इति ह ब्राह्मणम्' or 'इति विज्ञायते' which shows that Yâska

had in view some old authority in the form of a Brâhmaṇa passage. It is unfortunate that we can not trace back all such instances to their original, owing to the fact that many a Brâhmaṇa are lost, though their existence once is beyond doubt, owing to their being mentioned several times.

What sort of explanations and interpretations are attempted in the Nirukta, can be judged from the instances given below. In Nirukta II. 16, Yâska refers to the opinions of various former schools regarding the meaning of the word Vṛitra--

"तत्को वृत्रः। मेघ इति नैरुक्ताः। त्वाष्ट्रोऽसुर इत्यैतिहासिकाः। अपां च ज्योतिषश्च मिश्रीभावकर्मणो वर्षकर्म जायते। तत्र उपमार्थेन युद्धवर्णा भवन्ति। अहिवत्तु खलु मन्त्रवर्णाः ब्राह्मणवादाश्च। विवृद्ध्या शरीरस्य स्रोतांसि निवारयांचकार। तस्मिन्हते प्रसस्यन्दिरे आपः।"

" Who was Vṛitra ? 'A cloud', say the Nairuktas (etymologists). 'An Asura, son of Tvashṭṛi' say the Aitihâsikas (story-tellers); the fall of rain arises from the mingling of the waters and of light. This is figuratively depicted as a conflict. The hymns and Brâhmaṇas describe Vṛitra as a serpent; by the expansion of his body, he blocked up the streams. When he was destroyed, the waters flowed forth."

Then again Yâska, in Nir. III-8, alludes to the views of older writers regarding the Vedic word *pañcha jana*.

Thus we see that several older interpreters of the Vedas, both classes and individuals, are frequently referred to by Yâska though, unfortunately none of their works are available. Of these, the Nairukta is the most general name, meaning the old expounders of the

Veda, of the same type as Yâska himself, mainly taking their stand on etymological derivation. The Aitihâsikas who are generally referred to, while noticing differences in the conceptions of the Vedic gods, are those interpreters who take the euhemeristic view, according to which the gods of mythology were generally deified mortals and their deeds the amplification in imagination of human acts. In addition to the exposition of the Veda in the stricter sense, there existed also liturgical interpretations of numerous passages such as we find in the Brâhmaṇas and other kindred treatises, in which it was attempted to bring the letter of the received text into harmony with the existing ceremonial. Such liturgical interpretations are called by Yâska, those of the Yâjñikas or persons skilled in sacrificial rites. Akin to theirs appears to have been the mode of interpretation adopted by the Naidânas. By this we must probably understand tha method of explanation which, differing from the gramt matical etymologies, referred the origin of the words and conceptions to occasions which were in a certain sense historical.

I can not take leave of Yâska without quoting the following passage, in translation, from the 12th section of the 1st Pariśishṭa, which refers to the antiquity of the Mantras and the qualifications necessary for expounding them.

" This reflective deduction of the sense of the hymns is effected by the help of sacred tradition and reasoning. The texts are not to be interpreted as isolated, but according to their context. For, a person

who is not a Ṛishi or a devotee has no intuitive insight into their meaning. We have said before that among those men who are versed in tradition, he who is most learned, deserves especial commendation. When the Ṛishis were ascending, men inquired of the gods, 'who shall be our Ṛishis?' The gods gave them for a Ṛishi the science of reasoning, the art of deducing by reflection the sense of the hymns. Therefore, whatever meaning any learned man deduces by reasoning that possesses authority equal to a Ṛishi's."

Though this passage belongs to a chapter called परिशिष्ट or supplementary, and is regarded by Roth to be the work of some author subsequent to Yâska, still it is sufficient to establish the fact that the ancients distinctly recognized the necessity of reason as a co-factor in the ascertainment of religious truth or the definition of ceremonial practice or the interpretation of important or obscure scriptural passages. That the ancients had at least an idea of the new comparative method of interpretation, follows from this, whether they could actually use it in practice or not, is a different question. This passage marks a stage of thought when mere faith was found to be insufficient and unconvincing without reason, a view most emphatically expressed by Śankarâchârya afterwards, as opposed to the Sânkhyas, Naiyâyikas whose view is virtually, if not avowedly, founded on reasoning,

Pâṇini's grammar, as noticed already, mainly deals with the classical Sanskrit and treats the Vedic idiom

as only irregularities. He, too, mentions that the लेट् or subjunctive was only peculiar to the Vedic dialect and that it altogether fell into disuse in later sanskrit.

Śankarâchârya has written regular commentaries on all the principal Upanishads which, no doubt, belong to the Vedic canon but we are not immediately concerned with them. It is only occasionally that passages from the Saṁhitâs are interpreted by him, in the course of his argumentations, in his great Bháshya.

The pûrva-mímânsakas have made several contributions to the Vedic exegesis; the very object of the Mímânsâ, as Colebrooke says, is the interpretation of the Vedas. "Its purpose" says Somanâtha in his Mayúkhamâlâ, "is to determine the sense of revelation." But the rules and canons which they lay down, refer more to the application of the liturgical texts, and the ascertainment of the relative importance of texts when mutually inconsistent. The Vedic interpretation proper, they do not concern themselves with. However, to give you some idea of these rules laid down by the Mímânsakas, I may quote here one such canon which is very frequently referred to in sanskrit works. It runs thus—* 'श्रुतिलिंगवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानां समवाये पारदौर्बल्यमर्थविप्रकर्षादिति।' Direct mention, a mere indicatory mark, a sentence, context, order or place of mention and etymology, when any of these circumstances referring to the same text, lead to inconsistent conclusions, every following circumstance is weaker than every preceding one and thus must yield to it.

* Jaimini Sûtra. III. 3.

The most direct and the most important contributions, however, to the Vedic exegesis are by the great Sâyaṇâchárya, to whom Vedic students can never be too highly thankful. Vedârtha-prakâsá is a regular, detailed commentary on the Ṛigveda Samhitâ from beginning to end, with a very informing and learned introduction. Sáyaṇa was the minister of Bukkarâya the King of Vijayânagar, now lying in ruins, near Hampî on the Tungabhadrâ river, in the Bellary district. Bukka and Harihara who succeeded him, were brothers, who threw off the Mahomedan yoke and founded the empire of Vijayânagara, about the middle of the 14th Century A. D. It was under the patronage of these princes that Sâyaṇa and his brother Mâdhava who was looked upon as Guru by the princes, did all their literary work and set afloat a highly surprising literary activity. Sâyaṇa also wrote a commentary on the Aitareya Brâhmaṇa and Araṇyaka, on the Taittiríya Samhitá and so on. Mádhava afterwards called Vidyáraṇya Swámi is the author of the well-known Sarvadarsána-Sangraha or a compendium of all the philosophical systems, as well as of Panchadasì the most popular metrical treatise on Śánkara Vedânta.

In the Vedârthprakâśa, the commentary on the Ṛigveda, Sâyaṇa has paraphrased each and every word in the text, pointing out all grammatical peculiarities, giving etymological derivations of difficult and new words where possible, at the same time explaining the liturgical application of each and every verse or ऋच्. That this commentary of Sâyaṇa is full of defects from the modern point of view can not be denied. The

historical sense could not be present to his mind, on account of the view about the contents of the Ṛigveda, which he held. [illegible] him, th[illegible]veda, along with all other so-calle[illegible]canonical works called Veda, was a work, a store of wisdom, secular and philosophical, whose authority was not to be questioned. Every word of it was sacred. Naturally he could not entertain the idea of applying the rules of criticism to it, which were reasonable in the case of any other human composition. And again, the theological point of view swayed very strongly with Sâyaṇa. The Saṁhitâs mainly dealt with ritual, or at least were meant for application to ritualistic ceremonies, and throughout his explanations one can easily mark out the theological bias. At the beginning of every hymn Sáyaṇa, before commencing to paraphrase the actual text, first states the name of the sacrifice or the offering to which the hymn or its verses are subservient or at which they are to be recited.

Coming to actual textual explanations, we are struck with the impression that no living tradition relating to Vedic exegesis was present to the mind of Sâyaṇa. Whenever a word is obscure, we do not have a satisfactory explanation from him. In such cases, he generally proposes more than one explanation, without showing his preference to any one of them. Sometimes he has recourse to many curious devices in such cases of difficulty *e. g.* understanding any case form to have the meaning of any other case form, or connecting a verb with a subject without agreement in point of person or number.

धातूनामनेकार्थत्व, or the doctrine that a root can have more than one meaning is brought in by him to serve his purpose, times without number. Then again Sáyaṇa sees no objection to explaining words in an isolated manner, without caring to see whether the particular meaning which he assigns to the word in the particular passage, holds good in other similar passages where the word occurs in a similar connection. Like Yâska, he depends mainly on etymological derivations, and he has no scruple sometimes to take as implied or understood any word or words to complete the meaning of the sentence, when once he has started with it.

He frequently refers to the Sarvânukramaṇí, Brihad-devata, passages from the Brâhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas; and as a rule he quotes fully the explanations of Yâska, wherever possible, beginning with the remark 'अत्र निरुक्तम्'. The Vedic myths he explains in the light of later Paurâṇic ideas with whose influence, of course, he is strongly imbued. So also, while explaining the occasion of certain hymns, Sáyaṇa quotes legends which are absolutely incongruous with the spirit of the Ṛigveda. One instance would suffice to give you an idea as to how the Vedic spirit was altogether forgotten or most wantonly misunderstood in later times. Of course Sâyaṇa is not to be held solely responsible for this, as this sort of misunderstanding had set in even as early as the Brâhmaṇas. In hymn X. 121, beginning with हिरण्यगर्भः समवर्तताग्रे etc." the refrain of every verse is 'कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम,' which literally translated, should mean, 'what god should we worship, with an offering or oblation ? ' a simple ques-

tion. The idea naturally seems to be an attempt to find out which is the most prominent, most true or powerful god. A yearning of the human heart to search after that god who, being the beginning of the world, and the first germ and the shaper of all life, reveals himself all over in nature. He sees the divinity in its manifestation now here, now there, now elsewhere, and again and again he always asks, doubting, seeking, and longing, "who is this god to whom we present our offering ?"

Now let us see how Sáyaṇa has explained the word कस्मै. In the very introduction to the hymn, he remarks, 'कशब्दाभिधेयः प्रजापतिर्देवता'. Every hymn, nay, every verse especially having reference to a sacrifice, must have a deity. In order to discover a deity where no deity existed, the most extraordinary objects, such as a present, a drum, stones, plants, were raised to the artificial rank of deities. In accordance with the same system, Sáyaṇa here (and he has the support of the Bráhmaṇas,) forgetful of the proper character of the hymn and of the deep longing of the poet for the unknown God, exalts the interrogative pronoun itself into a deity and acknowledges a god or who. In his commentary on the first verse, S. remarks:—

अत्र किंशब्दोऽनिर्ज्ञातस्वरूपत्वात् प्रजापतौ वर्तते। यद्वा सृष्ट्यर्थं कामयते इति कः। कमेर्डप्रत्ययः। यद्वा कं सुखं तद्रूपत्वात्क इत्युच्यते। अथवा इन्द्रेण पृष्टः प्रजापतिर्मदीयं महत्वं तुभ्यं प्रदाय अहं कः कीदृशः स्यामित्युक्तवान्। स इन्द्रः प्रत्यूचे यदीदं ब्रवीषि अहं कः स्यामिति तदेव त्वं भवेति। अतः कारणात्क इति प्रजापतिराख्यायते. Thus we have here four different explanations. The idea that these ancient hymns were written simply

for the sake of their sacrifices and that whatever interpretation they thought fit to assign to those acts must be borne out by the hymns, has vitiated the whole system of Indian exegesis. It might be justified perhaps, if it had only been applied to the purely sacrificial hymns, particularly to those which are found in Saṁhitás of the Sáma-veda and the Yajurveda. But the Ṛigveda, too, has experienced the same treatment at the hands of our commentators, and the stream of tradition flowing from the fountain-head of the original poets has, like the waters of the Saraswatí, disappeared in the sands of a desert. Not only was the true nature of the gods, completely lost sight of, but new gods were actually created out of words, which were never perhaps intended as names of divine beings as we see in the instance given just above.

So far I have pointed out the defects in Sáyaṇa's work from the modern and critical point of view. But I have not yet told the whole truth. There is another side to the picture. Can we imagine what would have been the condition of Vedic scholarship to-day, without this Vedárthaprakáśa of Sáyaṇa? Then only its full worth can be realised. The great Vedic exegesist of the 14th century has left no word unexplained howsoever obscure it may be. Though it is very easy to criticise his work, still every Vedic scholar must confess that without him no beginning even of the Vedic study was possible. I can not do better than quote an extract from Max Müller's preface to his Vedic hymns part I. p. XXX, "It is well-known to them who have followed my literary publications that I never enter-

tained any exaggerated opinion as to the value of the traditional interpretation of the Veda, handed down in the theological schools of India and preserved to us in the great commentary of Sáyaṇa. More than twenty years ago, when it required more courage to speak out than now, I expressed my opinion on that subject in no ambiguous language and was blamed for it by some of them who now speak of Sáyaṇa as a mere drag in the progress of Vedic scholarship. Even a drag, however, is sometimes more conducive to the safe advancement of learning than a whip; and those who recollect the history of Vedic scholarship during the last five and twenty years know best that with all its faults and weaknesses, Sáyaṇa's commentary was a *sine quá non*, for a scholarlike study of the Ṛigveda. I do not wonder that others who have more recently entered on that study are inclined to speak disparagingly of the scholastic interpretations of Sáyaṇa. They hardly know how much we all owe to his guidance in effecting our first entrance into this fortress of Vedic language and Vedic religion, and how much even they, without being aware of it, are indebted to that Indian Eustathius. I do not withdraw an opinion which I expressed many years ago and for which I was much blamed at the time, that Sáyaṇa in many cases teaches us how the Veda ought not to be, rather than how it ought to be understood. But, for all that, who does not know how much assistance may be derived from a first translation, even though it is imperfect, nay, how often the very mistakes of our predecessors help us in finding the right track? If now we can walk without

Sáyaṇa,* we ought to bear in mind that five and twenty years ago, we could not have made even our first steps, we could never at least have gained a firm footing without his leading strings. If, therefore, we can now see further than he could, let us not forget that we are standing on his shoulders."

But things have grown much brighter for Sáyaṇa. A positive worth is discovered in Sáyaṇa's work by Vedic scholars like Geldner and Pischel; and in many cases it is Sáyaṇa who hits upon the right and the only right meaning of a word or a passage, though of course no earnest seeker after truth would attach any worth to his grammatical and etymological artificial devices. We may take one instance to illustrate the truth of this. Roth—who was the first to come forth against conservative Sanskritists and to assert that any European conscientious exegesist can understand Veda better and more correctly than Sáyaṇa—remarks that all the Indian commentators explain the word पुरीष as 'water'; whereas, the word really must mean quite the opposite, i. e. 'land'. Now this is not quite correct. No doubt Sáyaṇa, in many of the passages in Ṛigveda where the word occurs, explains it as 'उदक'. But in X. 27. 21, he explains the word पुरीषात् as पूरकात् मण्डलात्, thereby hitting upon the original meaning of the word even more correctly than Roth himself. पुरीष means 'orb', a 'circle' and is there used to denote, just like the word मण्डल, 'region', 'domain', 'land' 'earth' as opposed to the 'sea or ocean.' While Sáyaṇa in Ṛigveda I. 163. 1, explains पुरीषात् as 'सर्वकामानां पूरका:-

*I doubt this very much even to day.

दकात्', in the same verse, however, as it occurs in Taitt. S. 4, 2, 8, 1, he explains it as 'पुंस्त्वशक्तिसंपन्नान्महतोऽश्वात्' and Mahídhara explains it as 'पशोः सकाशात्' in Vájas. S. 29, 12. In Ṛigveda V. 55. 5, S. explains पुरीषिणः as 'पुरीषं उदकं हे तद्वन्तः', while in Taitt. S. 2, 4, 8, 2, 'पांसुयुक्तान् भूप्रदेशान्'. In Taitt. S. 4, 3, 1, S. says, 'पुरीषशब्देन नद्यादिगताः सिकता उच्यन्ते.' In the same way Mahídhara explains the word in Vaj. S. 13, 53, who never seems to give the meaning of water but paraphrases it always as पूरक, पूरण, पूरकं वस्तु ; while on Vaj. S. 11, 44, he says—'पुरीषशब्देन पांसुरूपा मृदुच्यते.' Thus we see here, that the meaning which Roth gives to the word पुरिष was well known to Indian Scholiasts and was accounted for in a more correct manner*.

It was remarked above that there appears to be no unbroken tradition of Vedic exegesis ; and this distinctly follows from the fact that S. in a large number of cases proposes a number of derivations of one and the same word. He simply gives the views sometimes of old learned exegesists. He mentions several schools and works, but unfortunately he does not throw any light upon the exact sources of information of which he makes use in his own interpretation of the Veda. Thus he has made use of Bhaṭṭabháskaramiśra, Skandaswámin, Kapardi Swámin ; he also refers to नैरुक्ताः ऐतिहासिकाः, पौराणिकाः, शाब्दिकाः, संप्रदायविदः, आत्मविदः, वृद्धशासनम् ; he also mentions पूर्वे भाष्यकृतः, अपरे केचन, and ushers in different views with such words as अन्य आह, अपर आह, कश्चिदाह.

* See Vedische Studien Vol. I. Introd. p. VI.

There are several other commenatries on Ṛigveda mentioned, but we know nothing exactly about them. Thus there are रावणभाष्य, कौशिकभाष्य, गूढार्थरत्नमाला. देवराज in his commentary on Nirukta, also mentions the वेदभाष्याणि of भवस्वामिन्, राहदेव श्रीनिवास, माधवदेव, all of whom seem to be older than Sáyaṇa.

महीधर and उव्वट are the great and equally important commentators on Yajurveda, but we are not concerned with them here except when we have to refer to their interpretation of verses common to both Ṛigveda and Yajurveda. To the Vaidika Bráhmins of this day, the credit of preserving the text in a wonderfully correct manner is due, but towards Vedic exegesis they have contributed nothing.

LECTURE—VI.

THE METHOD OF STUDYING THE RIGVEDA.

The method is everything—The right spirit of searching after truth—The object of including Rigveda in the curriculum—The orthodox view—the historical stand-point—wanting the spirit of inquiry—the historical and comparative method—the golden mean—a concrete illustration of the method—the words अरि and अर्य in the Rigveda.

So far I have given you some idea of the work done by ancient and modern scholars in the field of Vedic exegesis. Now I should like to make a few remarks on the method of studying Ṛigveda. Method is everything in every branch of study, but more so in the matter of the study of Ṛigveda. At school and at college you study several subjects not so much to bear the results or the concrete facts in mind, as to receive a particular training of the intellect and emotions, which object is gained not by the mechanical cramming of facts but by the particular method which has been inculcated in your mind and which has become a habit with you. The spirit of an honest search after truth is the chief thing in all education. To collect facts with accuracy, to shift them with a spirit of honest inquiry, criticise them with a liberal broad-mindedness not allowing yourself to be influenced by unreasonable patriotism or unnecessary bias, at the same time trying

to understand the tradition if any, with due sympathy and then only to draw a conclusion where possible, this is the habit without which no one can be a scholar, especially in the field of the study of Ṛigveda. And it is with the object of engendering this habit, that Ṛigveda is included in the curriculum of our University. It may be even of some use to commit to memory the meanings of some words and the translation of some verses; but that is not all. If you have not acquired patience and perseverance in the search after truth with an unprejudiced mind, well then the time you have spent in the study of Ṛigveda is a mere waste.

The orthodox Pandits regarded Veda as a revelation. The primeval sages like Vis'vâmitra and Vasishtha, Gritsamada and Atri had Dharma revealed to them while it was their only task to communicate it in the same form to others. As such the highest wisdom was contained in it, whose authority was not to be questioned. So far it was alright. But the predominance of elaborate ritual exerted undue influence over the interpretation of the Vedic texts which were solely regarded as subservient to that purpose. The theological standpoint of view prevailed and the only available full commentary on the Ṛigveda was written by a theologian of the first water. The historical standpoint was absolutely wanting. When we examine the contents of Ṛigveda by themselves, we may easily see that it cannot be one book written by one man, but that it is a library or literature in itself. This idea was not at all recognized by Sâyaṇa, which mars a good deal the value of his work.

Nor is it possible that there was any unbroken tradition carried on till the time of Sâyaṇa as proved above. Sâyaṇa scarcely waits to ask himself whether the meaning which he proposes for a particular word is justified by other observances of the word in other passages. The spirit of questioning is wanting. Hence dogmatic assertions are made, without any qualification. He could not be content with leaving a question open, even though there be not sufficient material to arrive at a decision.

When, however, European scholars proceeded with the study of the Ṛigveda, they proceeded naturally with a spirit of enquiry. But even amongst them there was once a school of the so-called conservative Sanskritists, headed by Wilson who held that Sâyaṇa's commentary was the only safe guide through the intricacies and obscurities of the text. Against these there stepped forth Roth, who revolutionised the whole thing and may be credited with having laid the foundation of the modern Vedic scholarship. He brought the Western methods to Eastern learning. Induction and comparison were the guiding principles of his method. The Ṛigveda was treated historically. He brought together the several passages where a certain word occurred, classified them, and fixed upon the stages through which the word has passed and thus gave, as it were, a history of the word from beginning to end. No prejudice, no misguided patriotism could blind him. But Roth went to the other extreme in his zeal to combat the conservative Sanskritists. He was too prone to conjecturing. Having no faith in Indian

commentators as a class, in his zeal to demolish the edifice of tradition, he raised a structure based upon sheer reason, one prejudice taking the place of another. Many of Roth's explanations are thus now found to be not convincing, if not totally wrong, though no doubt the credit of first raising the curtain in the drama of Vedic exegesis is his.

As, however, the study of the Vedas advanced more and more, the golden mean came to be followed. Due sympathy for traditional interpretations of Indian commentators, combined with the spirit of honest search after truth with patience and intelligence has come to be the principle guiding the course of Vedic studies. I believe that the best and most effective means of bringing home to you the nature of this method is to take a concrete instance and to apply the method to it. I now propose to determine the meaning of the words अरि and अर्य which occur so frequently in the Ṛigveda. In the first place, to narrow our field, let us bring together all the passages in the 7th Maṇḍala, where the forms of अरि and अर्य occur, and see how Sâyaṇa interprets them.

अरिः as well as अर्यः occur in VII. 64-3. Sây. explains both, as अर्यमा, a god mentioned along with मित्र and वरुण and further remarks—' अर्यम्णः पुनरभिधानमादरार्थम् '

अरिप्रं--VII. 47-1—Sây. पापरहितम्; अरिप्रा :—VII. 90-4—पापरहिताः ; Here, in the latter passage (उषसः) it is to be noted that the Pada-pâṭha has अरिऽप्राः, though the word is interpreted as made up of अ and रिप्र, by almost all.

The form अर्यः occurs in a very large number of cases in the 7th Maṇḍala itself:—

8-1—nom. sing. स्वामी, हविषां प्रेरको वा S.; 21-5—nom. sing. स्वामी (इन्द्रः) S., 21-9—gen. sing.—अर्यः अभीर्तिं अभिगमनम् S., who does not give another word for अर्यः but evidently takes it to mean अरेः; 31-5,—स्वामी (त्वम्) S.; Here the word अराव्णे is also used by its side; 34-18—अरयः nom. plu. S.; 48-3, L. 2—अरीन् S.; 48-3 L. 3—शत्रूणामभिगन्तारः S.; 56-22—अरेः शत्रोः सकाशात् (त्रातारः) S.; 60-11—ईरयति स्तुतीः प्रेरयति इत्यरिः स्तोता तस्य (मन्युं स्तोत्रं) S.; Here the word मघवानः is used by its side; 64-3-see above अरिः; 68-2—अरेः अस्माद्विरोधिनः— S.; 83-5—अरेः शत्रोः— S.; 86-7—स्वामी S.; 92-4—अरेः—S.; 100-5—स्वामी स्तुतीनां हविषां वा S.

Thus, we see that the form अर्यः is some times taken to be nom-sing. of अर्य, some times nom. plu. or accu. plu. of अरि, but very frequently, the geni. sing. of अरि. And the opposite meanings of 'a pious man and one who is not pious', 'a lord or friend' and 'an enemy' are attributed to the same word, which, no doubt, is a curious phenomenon, and involves great improbability.

As for the word अरि,* all are at one in attributing to it both a good and a bad meaning, though it is improbable that one and the same word should mean both 'a friend' (*e. g.* Ludwig I. 150-1; V. 33-6 and 9.) and 'an enemy' (*e. g.* Ludwig. VIII. 34-10; IX. 79-3) or 'the pious man' and his oppsite (*e. g.* I. 9-10; and I. 184-1; I. 185-9). Roth thinks that there are really two words; one from अर् and the other अ–रि from रा. Grassmann thinks

* This note is abbreviated from 'Vedische Studien' by Geldner and Pischel, Vol. III. p. 72 and ff.

of only one word, that from अर ; while Bergaigne thinks of only अ-रि from रा to give or रै wealth and अरि=a greedy man, an enemy or a poor man, thus a priest. He further says that अर्यः comes mostly from अरि and not so from अर्य. Oldenberg advocates the same view; though Geldner thinks that the 2nd meaning *i. e.* अ-रि is wrong.

The right meaning of the word is taught by Yâska in Nir. V. 7., where he says that अरि means अमित्र and ईश्वर.

1 अरि= rich, the rich man, the patron, ruler. In VIII. 2-14 and 13, Ṛg. the context distinctly shows that रेवत्=मघवन्=अरि.

So also in I. 150-1 and 2, Ṛg. we have a contrast between the really rich man and the falsely rich man and there अरि=धनिन्.

So in AV. 20, 127, 11, it is said of the glorifier of Indra, 'सर्वं इत्ते पृणात् अरिः'='every rich man will spend for thee with full hands'. And this would indeed prove more attractive to the singer than the false hope of the nobility of the greedy, as Oldenberg translates 'even the greedy will fill thee'. So in I. 184-1 and I. 185-9 (भूरि चिद् अर्यः सुदास्तराय--to one who is more liberal than the rich) the meaning ईश्वर only suits.

The use of अरि in the sing. preponderates, while the only instances where the plural can be said to be used without doubt are V. 33-2; VI. 20-1; VI. 25-7; VII. 48-3; VII, 92-4; X. 89-3.

The word अरि as used in connection with the war horse दधिक्रावन् and the horse of Pedu, means the same

thing. Thus हव्या अर्यः I. 116-6; जोहूत्रं अर्यः I. 118-9; चर्कृत्यं अर्यः IV. 38-2; all mean 'to be invoked by a rich man' and not by a poor man. Or अर्यः in these cases may be the Abl. rather than the Geni. and the expressions mean 'who is more praised than a rich man'. For such a use of the Abl. giving the adj. the sense of the compar. cf: 'अरित्रं वां दिवः पृथु' I. 46-8. So also in R. V. VIII. 19-36, we have मंहिष्ठो अर्यः सत्पतिः—'the noble lord, who is more liberal than every rich man.'

If we compare the various passages containing the phrase अय आ, we find that the word विश्व generally precedes it; by placing these passages side by side with others in which विश्व and अरि come together we shall see that अरि means ईश्वर, the rich man, while विश्व = the general class of men; the mass.

IX. 61-11—एना विश्वानि अर्य आ द्युम्नानि मानुषाणां सनामहे- 'the honors of men, down to the rich; even of the rich man.'

X. 191-1—विश्वान्यर्य आ.

VI. 45-33; VIII. 94-3. In all the passages आ= अभिविधि and the idea is 'all even including the rich'.

X. 28-1—विश्वो हि अन्यो अरिः आजगाम—'every other man even the rich, has come'.

VIII. 1-22—विश्वगूर्तो अरिष्टुत, 'glorified by all, praised even by the rich man'.

I. 61-9—विश्वगूर्तः स्वरिः 'praised by all, he to whom even the rich man is well-disposed (शोभनः अरिः यस्मै)'. अरि and सूरि are on a level and refer to the same persons, instead of meaning opposite persons. (*e.g.* poor and rich). Thus in VI. 25-7 अस्माकासो…अर्यः सूरयः= rich patrons;

cf. अस्माकासश्च सूरयः I. 97-3; and V. 10-6, also अस्माकासो मघवानः VII. 78-5 and VII. 92-4.

X. 20-4—अर्यो विशां गातुः एति—Here an antithesis between the rich man and the ordinary man is meant.

So also I. 4-6—उत नः सुभगाँ अरिः वोचेयुः दस्मकृष्टयः

III. 43-2—अति चर्षणीः आँ अर्यः—'come to us across the ordinary people, even the rich'.

VIII. 34-10— आ याहि अर्यः आ परि स्वाहा सोमस्य पीतये.

Also I. 9-10. In I. 126-5 we have 'अरिधायसः गाः'—'cows which satisfy or nourish even the rich.'

So also cf. VII. 100-5, where अर्यः='of a rich man'. After having fixed the general meaning ईश्वर for अरि, we now come to other more particular meanings of the word, following from the general one.

2. अरि=मघवन्—the patron, the rich यजमान.

VII. 92-4.; X. 39-5. (Sây. अरि=मन्ता, पतिः, यजमानः); VII. 64-3. 'अवयथा न आद् अरिः सुदासे'—'So that the patron can recommend us to another generous donor, or to king Sudâs.'

VII. 34-9—'उपमं केतुं अर्यः' 'the standard, the type of a patron'

So अर्यः गिरः=the song of the patron, *i. e.* the song ordered by the यजमान and recited for him by the priest. thus I. 122-14; X. 148-3.

3. अरि=मघवन् इन्द्र. cf. V. 33-6.

As greed and niggardliness are also associated with the rich man who does not give away riches or utilise them in performing sacrifices and rewarding priests, अरि then came to have the bad meaning, though this can not be established etymologically. By the side of such

expressions as रेवता पणिना IV. 25-7, रेवान् अदाशुरिः VIII. 45-15, we have also अर्यो अदाशुषः IX. 23-3. Notice the word कदर्य—which lit. means 'a bad master'—meaning 'a niggardly person'. So also in classical Sk. literature riches are often denounced, which easily accounts for the change of meaning of the word अरि from 'a rich man', to 'a greedy man'. Thus in II. 12-4 and 5 अरि is used in this sense; cf. I. 81-9; where इंद्र is asked to confiscate the wealth of the अरि. The same idea is met with in IX. 23-3; V. 2-12; I. 33-3; VIII. 21-6. In all these passages, the अरि is spoken of with so much contempt that अरि comes to mean 'an enemy'. The idea that a rich man is hated on account of his riches and that riches makes men enemies of each other, is very frequently met with in classical Sanskrit literature. Thus अरि first means 'the rich rival', or 'the patron of the opposite party', and then the hostile patron and the enemy, the rival. He who thinks this change of meaning too forced and artificial, should remember the word भ्रातृव्य which means 'a nephew' and 'a rival' too.

Thus the word अरि means 'a rich man', 'a greedy person' 'a rival,' 'an enemy'. It is difficult to determine which particular meaning the word has, as the meanings themselves are difficult to be distinguished in a cut and dry manner. When the description refers to a battle, or when even a sacrificial meeting is represented as a battle, then the bad meaning is applicable.

Thus in VII. 48-3—विश्वान् अर्यः = all the rich rivals, and अर्यः शत्रोः = of the rich enemy; cf. VIII. 65-9—विश्वान् अर्यः विपश्चितः अति ख्यः "Leave unheeded all the singers of the rich rival."

Cf. II. 23-5-- अति यद्र्यो अर्हाद्...द्रविणम्--'the wealth, that is more worthy than that of the rival'.

VII. 68-2--तिरो अर्यो हवनानि श्रुतं नः --'Unheeding the invokations of the rival, listen to ours.' Also cf IV. 29-1; VIII. 33-14; VIII. 66-12; VIII. 65-9.

Also VII. 31-5--'मा नो निदे च वक्तवे अर्यो रन्धीः अराव्णे ... cf VIII. 48-8.

Also अर्यो अरातयः--the bad will of the rival or the enemy; VI. 48-16; VII. 83-5; etc.

As for the word अर्य, Naigh II. 22 gives अर्य as one of the synonyms of ईश्वर. Pāṇ. III. 1-103 has 'अर्यः स्वामिवैश्ययोः'. In Veda it is used to mean 'master', 'ruler'. cf VIII. 1-34; VIII. 51-9; IV. 16-17; X. 34-13; VII. 65-2; II. 35-2; IV. 1-7; V. 16-3; VII. 8-1. On VI. 47-9, Sāy. has 'अर्यो धनस्य स्वामी अन्यः कश्चित्'. So also V. 33-9.

Even in those passages, where अर्य and दास are mentioned side by side, अर्य need not mean an Aryan, but only a master, lord--*e. g.* in VII. 86-7 अर्यपत्नी and दासपत्नी are used of waters--meaning respectively 'owned by Indra' and 'owned by robbers.' Also VII. 6-5; and X. 43-8.

In classical Sk. अरि means only 'enemy', अर्य is obsolete and आर्य means 'the Aryan.'

LECTURE VII.

THE DIFFERENT VIEWS HELD REGARDING THE CONTENTS OF THE RIGVEDA.

The orthodox view—the Vedas are inspired and infallible—The idea that the Samhitás and Bráhmaṇas are inferior to the Upanishads—passages referring to the making or composing of hymns—a superhuman character ascribed to the Rishis—How to reconcile the contradictory ideas—The view that Vedas are a babbling of primitive people—The view that Rigveda is not only a poem but a history—Religious, philosophical and secular hymns—the wedding hymn X. 85.—The funeral hymn X. 18.—Historical hymns—Dána—Stutis—A humorous hymn—Didactic-gnomic hymns—formulas of incantation—poetical riddles.

Now we proceed to consider and discuss the different views held regarding the contents of the Rigveda. The orthodox view is that the Ṛigveda (or Veda in general) is the eternal storehouse of highest knowledge, that it is inspired or is of divine origin, that it is not a human composition and that it is endowed with supernatural efficacy. Inspiration and infallibility are the two chief attributes of the Veda. Here it would be interesting to know what opinions post-Vedic works held in this matter, and whether they are confirmed by an examination of the contents of the Ṛigveda itself. To begin with, I may quote the following passage from the Śatapatha Bráhmaṇa X.

4-2- 21—23 in translation. "Then he looked around upon all beings. He beheld all beings in this triple Vedic Science. For, in it is the soul of all metres, of all hymns of praise, of all breaths, of all the gods. This, indeed, exists. It is an undying thing. For that which is undying (really) exists. This is that which is mortal. Prajápati reflected, 'All beings are comprehended in the triple Vedic Science: come, let me dispose myself in the shape of the triple Vedic science'...You know the well-known verse in the पुरुषसूक्त which is generally regarded later in character than the older parts of Ṛigveda or Ṛigveda proper, "तस्माद्यज्ञात्सर्वहुत: ऋच: सामानि जज्ञिरे। छन्दांसि जज्ञिरे तस्मात् यजुस्तस्मादजायत॥ From the अथर्ववेद and from the पुराणs a large number of passages may be quoted bearing on this subject, which all agree in preaching that the Veda had a divine or mystic origin. All this while, however, there was another idea running through all sorts of works, viz., the inferiority of the Saṁhitá proper in comparison with the Upanishads or अध्यात्मशास्त्र. That the Veda deals with only कर्म whose fruit howsoever glorious and pleasing at first is after all perishable; while ज्ञान or knowledge alone is the efficient means of highest bliss, is an idea met with everywhere. The Vedic hymns, though a divine origin is, no doubt, allowed to them are at all events depreciated, as parts of the inferior science, in contrast to the Brahma Vidyá or knowledge of Brahma, the highest of all knowledge. In this connection I may adduce the well-known passage from the छान्दोग्य उपनिषद् VII. I. 1—"अधीहि भगव: इति ह उपससाद सनत्कुमारं नारद: तं...होवाच यद्वेत्थ तेन मोपसीद। ततस्त

ऊर्ध्वं वक्ष्यामीति स होवाच ॥ १ ॥ ऋग्वेदं भगवोऽध्येमि यजुर्वेदं सामवेदमाथर्वणं चतुर्थमितिहासपुराणं पञ्चमं वेदानां वेदं पित्र्यं राशिं दैवं निधिं वाकोवाक्यमेकायनं देवविद्यां ब्रह्मविद्यां भूतविद्यां क्षत्रविद्यां नक्षत्रविद्यां सर्पदेवजनविद्यामेतद्भगवोऽध्येमि ॥ २ ॥ सोऽहं भगवो मन्त्रविदेवास्मि नात्मविच्छ्रुतं ह्येव मे भगवद्दृशेभ्यस्तरति शोकमात्मविदिति सोऽहं भगवः शोचामि तं मा भगवाञ्छोकस्य पारं तारयत्विति तं होवाच यद्वै किंचैतदध्यगीष्ठा नामैवैतत् ॥ ३ ॥ नाम वा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेद आथर्वणश्चतुर्थ इतिहासपुराणः पञ्चमो वेदानां वेदः ………… ॥ ४ ॥ स यो नाम ब्रह्मेत्युपास्ते यावन्नाम्नो गतं तत्रास्य यथाकामचारो भवति यो नाम ब्रह्मेत्युपास्तेऽस्ति भगवो नाम्नो भूयइति नाम्नो वाव भूयोऽस्तीति—तन्मे भगवान्ब्रवीतु इति." In this passage, all the Vedic Saṁhitás and other branches of knowledge are spoken of as being merely a name, mere pedantry, not able to free you from misery. But the knowledge of the soul by which alone you can get beyond misery is something over and above all this learning. The same thought prevails in the Bhagavadgítá II. 42 and ff. "यामिमां पुष्पितां वाचं प्रवदन्त्यविपश्चितः। वेदवादरताः पार्थ नान्यदस्तीति वादिनः ॥ ४२ ॥ कामात्मानः स्वर्गपरा जन्मकर्मफलप्रदाम्। क्रियाविशेषबहुलां………… त्रैगुण्यविषया वेदा निस्त्रैगुण्यो भवार्जुन। यावानर्थ उदपाने सर्वतः संप्लुतोदके। तावान्सर्वेषु वेदेषु ब्राह्मणस्य विजानतः ॥." Here, the Vedas are condemned as being flowery speech dealing with actions and their rewards, of no value to the possessor of the knowledge of Brahma. That the Veda deals with something supernatural which cannot be made known by ordinary perception and inference is the idea running through the following extract from the Vedárthaprakâśa of Mádhavácharya on the Taittiríya Yajurveda (p.1 ff. in the Bibliotheca Indica). 'इष्टप्राप्त्यनिष्टपरिहारयोरलौकिकमुपायं यो ग्रन्थो वेदयति स वेदः। अलौकिकपदेन प्रत्यक्षानुमाने व्यावर्त्येते।'

In जैमिनियन्यायमालाविस्तर (I. 1. 25 and 26), the idea that the Veda had any personal author is contradicted.

'पौरुषेयं न वा वेदवाक्यं स्यात्पौरुषेयता। काठकादिसमाख्यानाद्वाक्यत्वाच्चान्यवाक्यवद् ॥ समाख्याध्यापकत्वेन वाक्यत्वं तु पराहतम्। तत्कर्त्रनुपलम्भेन स्यात्ततोऽपौरुषेयता ॥'

The same view will be found to have been held by all post-Vedic works, that the Vedas are not the work of a personal author, that their authority is self-evident, that therefore they are eternal and self-evident. Here I may explain the meaning of अपौरुषेयत्व which is so frequently asserted about the Vedas. The नैयायिकs, while admitting the unquestionable authority of the Vedas and basing their ideas of the self thereupon, at the same time assert that they are the works of ईश्वर, the Highest Self, who is all-pervading, omni-scient and free from desire, happiness etc. They argue that just as the works of ordinary type are written by human authors *e.g.* Raghuvamśa by Kálidása and so on, so also the Vedas, being as much compositions as Raghuvamsa must have some author and that is none but ईश्वर who is far superior to ordinary souls. Hence the authoritativeness of the Vedas. Against this the Vedantins argue that the वेदs are not पौरुषेय but they are अपौरुषेय and this अपौरुषेयत्व is technically explained by them thus.—

' नहि तावत्पुरुषेणोच्चार्यमाणत्वं पौरुषेयत्वं, गुरुमतेऽपि अध्यापकपरम्परया पौरुषेयत्वापत्तेः। नापि पुरुषाधीनोत्पत्तिकत्वं पौरुषेयत्वं.........किंतु सजातीयोच्चारणानपेक्षोच्चारणविषयत्वम्। तथा च सर्गाद्यकाले परमेश्वरः पूर्वसर्गसिद्धवेदानुपूर्वीसमानानुपूर्वीकं वेदं विरचितवान् न तु तद्विजातीयं वेदमिति न सजातीयोच्चारणानपेक्षोच्चारणविषयत्वं पौरुषेयत्वं वेदानाम्।

भारतादीनां तु सजातीयोच्चारणमनपेक्ष्यैवोच्चारणमिति तेषां पौरुषेयत्वम्।'§ Thus the अपौरुषेयत्व consists in the fact that the Vedas in this creation are exactly like those in the previous creation and so on without beginning.

If, however, we turn to the Ṛigveda itself and examine its contents with a view to determine the question before us, what do we find ? We find a very large number of passages where we have a distinct reference to the facts—that (1) the hymns were composed or made by the sages or ऋषिs with whom they are associated (2) that there are old and new Ṛishis and hymns spoken of separately.

Thus we have VII. 35. 14–' इदं ब्रह्म क्रियमाणं नवीयः ', VII. 37. 4 ' ब्रह्म कृण्वन्तो हरिवो वसिष्ठाः, ' VII. 97. 9 ' ब्रह्मेन्द्राय वज्रिणे अकारि ', and so on.

In the following passages, the word तक्ष् to fashion or fabricate is applied to the composition of hymns :—

Thus—VII. 7. 6. ' मन्त्रं ये वारं नर्या अतक्षन् '. So also II. 19. 8. II. 35. 2 and so on.

So also we may compare—VII. 15. 4—' नवं नु स्तोमम्अग्नये......जीजनम् ' ; VII. 22. 9—' इंद्र ब्रह्माणि जनयंत विप्राः ' ; VII. 26. 1—' तस्मा उक्थं जनये यज्जुजोषत ' ; VII. 31. 11—' इंद्राय ब्रह्म जनयंत विप्राः ' ; VII. 94. 1—' इयं......पूर्व्यस्तुतिः अभ्राद्वृष्टिरिवाजनि '.

It is, of course, very possible that in some cases this making or fashioning or generating of hymns may mean nothing more than uttering or reciting the prayers on the occasion. The passages in which ancient and modern Ṛishis, and old and new hymns are spoken of, have been given above in Lecture 3.

§ वेदान्तपरिभाषा—end of आगमपरिच्छेद.

By the side of these, there are, however, other passages in which a certain superhuman character seems to be ascribed to some of the Ṛishis, and divine inspiration is supposed to have given rise to hymns, to which also a mysterious or magical power is ascribed. I may here refer to one such passage in connection with the Ṛishi Vasishṭha, the author of the 7th Maṇḍala—

VII. 33. 7 to 13 verses—त्रयः कृण्वन्ति भुवनस्य रेतः etc.

In VII. 87-4 and VII. 88-4 there are references to knowledge supernaturally communicated or favours divinely conferred on Vasishṭha. The same is said of Viśvámitra, the author of Maṇḍala III., in III. 29-15; III. 43-5; and III. 53-9. वाच् is personified and highly eulogised, *e. g.* in X. 125, and the divine speech is described as having entered into the Ṛishis. *e. g.* X. 71-3—

'यज्ञेन वाचः पदवीयमायन् तामन्वविन्दन् ऋषिषु प्रविष्टाम्।'

In the following passages, a miraculous power is attributed to the prayers of the Ṛishis—

III. 53.12–विश्वामित्रस्य रक्षति ब्रह्म इदं भारतं जनम्।

VII. 33.3–'एवं नु कं दाशराज्ञे सुदासम् प्रावद् इन्द्रो ब्रह्मणा वो वसिष्ठाः।

VII. 33.5– वसिष्ठस्य स्तुवतः इन्द्रः अश्रोत उरुं तृत्सुभ्य अकृणोद् लोकम्।

At the same time, we have passages in which the Ṛishis distinctly speak of their own consciousness of ignorance and inability to fathom the profound depths of the universe and knowledge, as against the omniscience ascribed to them by later writers. *e. g.* Ṛigveda I. 164-5, 6 and 37.

How to reconcile all these various ideas present in the Ṛigveda? It is quite clear that some of the

Ancient Ṛishis entertained a belief, though, no doubt, indistinct and hesitating, in their own inspiration. This belief was not then suffered to die out in the minds of later generations. On the contrary this belief grew up by degrees into a fixed persuasion that all the literary productions of these early sages had not only resulted from a supernatural impulse but were infallible, divine and even eternal.

I had above referred to the idea that the Saṁhitás of the Veda though regarded as revelation, were, however, regarded as inferior or lower in character, as compared with the अध्यात्मशास्त्र in the Upanishads. This view was furthered by the Mímánsakas and in Sáyaṇa's commentary we see that the ritualistic purpose is prominently held before our view in the interpretation of the text.

Now coming to the views held by the moderns in this matter, I have first to refer to the view that the Ṛigveda is merely a collection of poems, which suggested themselves to the Ṛishis on the spur of the moment. The Primitive Aryans were children easily susceptible to the influence of their surroundings, highly imaginative, simple and innocent. Just as children conspicuously show a tendency to make god of everything that they see, or by virtue of their fresh and creative imagination not checked by commonsense or practical consideration, are highly optimistic and can turn the clouds into elephants and camels, in the same way the Aryans of the Ṛigveda, highly struck with admiration and wonder at the sight of the various phenomena of nature, burst forth into praises of an

inspired character, showing a child-like familiarity with the gods created or rather discovered by them, full of hope and cheerfulness, the special characteristic of childhood, knowing no fear of worldly evils and misfortunes.

This view has been now mostly set aside or substantially modified, as the hymns of the Ṛigveda have come to be studied more closely and critically. That the Aryans of the Ṛigveda were not absolutely primitive, but that they were in a sufficiently advanced stage of civilization is a fact most clearly proved by the contents of the hymns themselves. Besides the form of metres, their variety and artisticness, all these go to prove the same fact.

Another view was recently advocated by an Indian gentleman that Ṛigveda is not only a poem, but a history referring to the social life of the time and the mutual wars and other incidents. The incident of the Paṇis stealing the cows and Saramá tracing them for the Angirasas is interpreted as referring to the actual hostility between the Phœnicians and the Angirasas, of whom the present Brahmins are descendants. Thus, according to this view, the term पणि is equivalent to the Phœnicians, the term गा to cows, and सरमा to some Phœnician woman enslaved by the Angirasas, the Aryas including both अंगिरसs and पणिs.

Thus the following facts have been deduced from the hymns.—

A great war broke out, in the remote old days between the Indian Aryans and the Phœnicians, in which the latter were defeated and compelled to leave

wholly or partially the land of the Aryans. Most of the Súktas of the Ṛigveda either describe or refer to this and many other wars. Thus the Ṛigveda is not a poem only, but a history. The Phœnicians were the first of the civilised nations of the world. The civilization of Assyria (derived from Asura), of Babylonia, Egypt, Greece and other ancient countries owed its origin to the union of the civilization of the Aryans with that of the Phœnicians. These Phœnicians originally lived in Afghanistan or in some parts of India, whence driven out, they migrated westwards to Arabia, to Egypt, Greece, Rome and so on. In ancient time the Red Sea and the Mediterranean were connected together by a strait through which the Phœnician and Aryan trading ships entered the Mediterranean. As that passage gradually silted up, the connection between India and Europe broke off. The primitive civilization of the world was born long before the time known to us.

Coming to a more particular examination of the contents of the Ṛigveda, we can divide the hymns generally into three classes,—Religious hymns, Philosophical hymns, and Secular hymns. As remarked already, the religious hymns form a very large majority. What the prevailing religious thought and belief is, we shall dwell on in another lecture. Suffice it to say here that all those hymns which are difinitely addressed to divinities, containing a eulogy of them and requests for granting of riches, progeny, and cattle and so on are included in the class religious. The philosophic hymns, very few in number, are those which re-

fer to such questions as who I am, whence I come, what is the prime cause of the universe and so on. These also will be dealt with elsewhere. Here I may deal at greater length with what I have called the Secular hymns. It is impossible to discriminate them sharply from the religious hymns, but here we mean by secular, those hymns, which are not specially directed to divinities.

Here we may best begin with those hymns which mark a transition, as it were, from the religious to the secular aspect of thought, those, for instance which refer to the wedding rite, or funeral rites, ceremonies which are partly religious and partly secular. In this connection the 85th Sûkta of the 10th Maṇḍala is most deserving of study. The marriage of Soma and Sûryá is the theme of this hymn, a pattern of married union in general. "As Sun and Moon ever support each other and alternate in their office, on the constant fulfilment of which depend not only the prosperity of all inanimate nature, but also the possibility of intercourse between men and the ordering of civil relations, even so man and wife must work together in harmony, and with united powers untiringly fulfil the duties laid upon them in their vocation for the advancement of the family."* I recommend the hymn to you for study, as it throws most important light on the rite of marriage. The bridegroom with his right hand takes the right hand of the bride with this formula:—

*Rigveda by Kaegi p. 75.

"I take thy hand in mine for happy fortune that thou mayest reach old age with me, thy husband. Gods, Aryaman, Bhaga, Savitar, Purandhi, have given thee to be my household's mistress."*

What an important part was played by the wife in the Aryan household, and how sacred and dignified the rite of marriage was regarded, can be best judged from the admonitions and good wishes contained in the closing verses of the hymn, with which the newly married couple are greeted. I may quote here only one verse (X. 85. 46.) in translation.-

"So rule and govern in thy home
Over thy husband's parents both;
His brother and his sister, too,
Are subject likewise there to thee."

The next hymn to be noted in this connection is the funeral hymn—X. 18, which should be read wholly, as it gives us a good idea of the most solemn rite prevalent amongst the Aryans.

Next we have to consider the so-called historical hymns. They are historical only in the sense that they refer to the victory and triumph of some princes or princely families, although fragmentary in character. Although the really historical gain is not very rich, and the statements are exceedingly deficient, still these fragments give us a glance into the active, war-disturbed life of the Vedic times. The Kings seek to win the favour of god Indra and secure for themselve success against their enemy; but this they can do only by

* Rig. X. 85. 36

means of a prayer poured from their heart and fashioned after the model of the ancients, in honour of that God, for which they employ priests like Visvámitra and Vasishṭha, who in their turn highly eulogise the liberality of the patron princes. In this connection, may be noticed the hymn; VII. 18. also VII 33. 1—7; VII. 83.

In this connection are to be noticed the so-called दानस्तुतिs or praises of gifts. These are portions, not of the very highest poetical order, interpolated among or added to the original hymns, which while praising the generosity of the princes who bestowed presents on the Ṛishis, throw light on the names of tribes and kings and also on the families of singers and their genealogies. As an instance of such a दानस्तुति ee verses 22–25 of VII. 18; also V. 30. 12–15.*

We may also notice a humorous hymn in which the poet banteringly likens the awakening of the frogs at the beginning of the rainy season, their merry croaking and their jollity to the songs of priests intoxicated with Soma. See VII. 103. Though Muir and Max Müller regard this hymn as a satire, still Haug and Bühler do not so regard it. They think that frogs and priests are mentioned together only because both have reference to rain. This is one of the three rain-bringing hymns, the others being VII. 101; and VII. 102.

There are also many instances of a didactic-gnomic kind in which proverbial thoughts and sententious maxims are brought together in the form of

* Instances may be multiplied. VI. 47.22; VIII. 1. 32 ff; VIII. 4. 20 ff.; VIII. 5. 37ff ; X. 62. 8; I. 126. 1; VIII. 46.33 (women were given as slaves).

a verse; the ripe practical experience is summed up briefly. Thus X. 117 is a collection of sayings, so also the Song of Wisdom X. 71.

About woman several things favourable and unfavourable are said in a sententious manner. Thus VIII. 33. 17—'Woman's mind is hard to direct aright' etc. X. 95. 15—'There can be no friendship with women, their hearts are those of hyenas'. On the other hand, we have a more favourable verdict in V 61. 6. 7—'And many a woman is often better than the man etc.' Also in X. 27. 12 the idea is that maidens are often wooed for the sake of rich possessions. VI 58. 5—even an ugly man becomes beautiful only if he has cows or riches, IV 74. 9 and many more.

Formulas of incantation and exorcism are also to be found in the Ṛigveda, though their proper department is really the Atharva-veda. The healing of a sick person is accomplished in X. 60. 12; Indra heals a woman afflicted by skin disease VIII. 80; in X. 161. 2. and 5. one who is near to death is recalled to life. A bad omen is averted in X. 164. 5; in X. 145 a girl seeks to drive off a successful rival and to bind the man to her. A maiden awaiting her lover seeks to put the whole household to sleep in VII. 55. 5—8 .

Before concluding, I have to refer to the so-called poetical riddles or ब्रह्मोद्य in which things are described not by their direct names but by round about and enigmatical expressions, by symbolical and mystical references, numbers playing an important part. Hymn VIII 29 is a good instance, simplest of its kind. Thus

in verses 4, 5, 7, 8, of this hymn, the gods Indra, Rudra, Vishṇu and Aświns are spoken of, without their names being mentioned, but they can be guessed from the very short descriptions typical of them. Much more intricate and difficult are the symbolic descriptions of Heaven and Earth, Sun and Moon, the atmosphere, the cloud, rain, the Sun's rays, the year, seasons, months etc. for which I recommend the hymn I. 164 which is a mixtum compositum of such riddles or trying questions, reminding us of what are in Marathi called उखाणाे.

LECTURE VIII.

RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY OF RIGVEDA.

No fixed religion, but a procession of ideas—not primitive but civilized—the practical and utilitarian character—a hieratic religion—a religion of the upper classes—enjoyment of the present life—simplicity and sincerity—transparency of conceptions—arrested personification—comparison with Greek Mythology—Henotheism—the threefold division—A difference in the conceptions of Gods in the Rigveda and in the Purāṇas—Agni—His three forms—His birth—the messenger—important attributes—the myth of Agni concealing himself—Indra—opaque and Indo-European—fondness of Soma—God of physical power—the national hero of the Aryans—His exploit over Vritra—the storm theory—the dawn theory—the spring theory.

A very large number of the hymns of the Ṛigveda is religious in character as opposed to secular; and hence you would be anxious to know what religion these hymns contain. But let me tell you at the very threshold of the subject that it is a very hard task, nay, almost an impossible task to answer exactly the point in question. Because in the first place, most of these hymns are mere prayers generally connected with some sacrifice or other, and in the second place, there is no attempt at system, the collection being nothing but individual prayers addressed on very various occasions, by several Ṛishis who were perhaps separated

from each other by long intervals. Thus, we have in the Ṛigveda a procession of thoughts, not a fixed, stereo-typed result. We see here how the ideas were formed and how they progressed ; we have not got one systematic whole, in which everything is complete and finished. Thus what I attempt to do in this lecture, is merely to indicate to you what ideas prevailed in the age of the Ṛigveda, as indicated by the hymns which we are studying. Certain tendencies and characteristic thoughts can be marked out as peculiar to the times, as the result of our study, and these I wish to point out succinctly to-day.

According to one view which was very strongly advocated during the early stages of the Vedic study, the Vedic religion is very primitive, the Vedic people being almost semi-barbarians. They were mere children dazed and surprised by the different natural phenomena, and stupefied with wonder and admiration. As a German nursery rhyme asks--"tell me how white milk can come from the red cow" so the Vedic Ṛishi is struck with wonder that in the raw cows, black of hue or ruddy, is stored the ripe milk glossy white in colour ; and this miracle is praised again and again as an evidence of divine power.*

But a careful study of the hymns would show that this view is not tenable. That the Vedic people had a civilization of their own, that the hymns mark a certain advanced stage in artistic and metrical correctness ; that the hymns are meant to serve a definite purpose *e. g.* of sacrifice, these are facts which every

* See Rigveda I. 62. 9 ; I. 180. 3 ; II. 40.2 ; and so on.

student of Ṛigveda will easily see for himself. That the sense of art was present to their mind clearly follows from such passages as these—I. 109. 1; I. 62. 13; II. 19. 8; VII. 7. 6; I. 171. 2; VII. 64. 4—in all of which the hymn or song is described as "well hewn," "well fashioned as a war chariot from the hands of a skilled artisan." cf: also X. 119. 5 'अहं तष्टेव वन्धुरं पर्येचामि हृदा मतिम्'.

A striking feature of the Vedic religion is its practical and utilitarian nature. The hymns though highly poetic and inspired in character are all at the same time incidental to the sacrifice. They are recited or sung by the priests or bards on occasions of sacrifice whether as mystic spells to accompany and sanctify the offerings or as rhapsodies to elevate and cheer up those present. The Ṛishis offer prayers and oblations of Soma or Ghee, expecting in return rewards from the Gods, such as long life, prosperity, cattle, warlike sons and so on. 'Give and take' is the simple law which is applicable to the dealings between men and Gods even. 'Reciprocity, frank, unconditional reciprocity becomes an accepted motive'.* cf.: the following instances from the 7th Maṇḍala. 1. 5; 1. 23; 1. 24; 8. 6; 15. 4; 15. 9; 16. 9, 10; 82. 7; etc.

Another trait of the Vedic religion which naturally follows from the above, is that it is essentially a religion of priests, a hieratic religion. The priests occupy a very important position, in the ritual, they serve as mediators between princes and Gods. Not only sacrifices but such important matters as the issues

* Bloomfield—Religion of the Veda, p. 184.

of a combat between rival princes or clans solely or at least mainly depend on the prayers of the priests if they take the heart of the Gods. The priests propitiate the Gods with prayers and offerings and the Gods thus pursuaded, actually take part, as it were, in the combat and make their favoured party victorious, rooting out and crushing the hostile army. In this connection I may recommend hymn 18 of M. 7. Also see hymn 83 of M. VII. where the Vasishṭhas invoke the assistance of Indra and Varuṇa in favour of their patron Sudâs. 'The enemies have circumscribed me, hear our call and come to us with succour' (VII. 83. 3). Then in verse 4 of the same hymn it is said 'you heard the prayers of these in the cries of war; effectual was the service of the Tṛitsus' priest.'

In this connection we are met with a curious idea and it is this, that both the parties in a combat call upon the God for assistance, but the God goes to one party whom he wants to favour; and the other party meets with a crushing defeat. "The men of both the hosts invoked you in the fight, Indra and Varuṇa, that they might win the wealth, what time ye helped Sudâs with all the Tṛitsu folk, when the ten kings had pressed him down in their attack." (Verse 6). The same idea is seen with regard to sacrifices, where also the priest always prays to the God thus—"Come to our prayers, oh Indra, thou who knowest; let thy steeds be yoked and guided hither; men of all kinds, indeed, invoke thee; still give thy ear to our prayers only, oh all-impeller." (VII. 28. 1). Thus the question arises; Were the Gods not able to be present at all sacrifices

simultaneously ?—I think the following verse answers the question—'With Soma, they brought Indra from a distance, over Vaiśanta, from the strong libation; Indra preferred Vasishṭhas to the Soma pressed by Pâśadyumna, Vâyata.' (VII. 33.2).

What is meant by all this is that a righteous, sincere prayer and a rich offering pursuaded the Gods to attend and bring success with them. The spiritual conception that he who has faith and God on his side has also success or victory with him, seems to be present here, and we need not bother ourselves with such questions as whether the Vedic Gods had personal forms or not and if they had them, how they could be present at all the sacrifices simultaneously—questions which occupied later theologians and even the author of Nirukta.

Thus, we see that the patrons or princes for whom the priests conducted the sacrifices found themselves between two exacting agencies. On the one hand, there were the Gods to whom they were to make rich offerings, on the other hand, there were the priests to whom they were to give fees and gifts. The दानस्तुतिs or praises of the liberal gifts conferred by certain rich patrons on priests distinctly point to this fact.

Another trait which strikes us is that the Vedic religion is a religion of the upper classes who are well-to-do. The religion of the Ṛigveda presupposes an established household of considerable extent; a wealthy and liberal householder, elaborate and expensive materials, and many priests, not at all shame-faced

about their fees."* It is to be distinguished from the popular religion, the religion of the poor, with its humble rites and its childish reliance upon sorcery and the medicine man, which is the religion of the Atharva-Veda and the Grihyasûtras.

The great object which the worshippers or householders would secure, is not immortality or heavens, but a long life for full hundred years, prosperity, warlike offspring, in short, all pleasures of this earth. Conquest of enemies, freedom from diseases, plenty of food and drink seem to be the happiest ideal which the Vedic Rishis placed before themselves. "Agni, bestow upon our chiefs and nobles that famous power, that wealth which feedeth many;" says Vasishtha. (VII. 5. 9.). "With precious things, oh Indra, thus content us; may we attain to thy exalted favour. Send our chiefs plenteous food with hero children. Preserve us evermore, ye Gods with blessings" (VII. 24.6). "A hundred autumns may we see that bright eye, beneficent to Gods, arise; a hundred autumns may we live." (VII. 67. 16). Thus we see that the Vedic Rishis enjoyed the life before them heartily, without showing any traces of disgust with the same. This life is uncertain, and perishable, this life is a dream and the worldly existence is unsubstantial. Death is nature, life is only an accident,–these and such other melancholy ideas are conspicuous by their absence. A spirit of healthy joy in the life we live, seems to pervade the Rigveda. It is only in very rare instances that immortality or dwelling with Gods in heaven is referred

* Bloomfield—The religion of the Veda, p. 77.

to. Thus in VII. 57. 6, we have "ददात नो अमृतस्य प्रजायै." 'Give us of Amṛita for the sake of the offspring.' But even here we are not certain of what the word Amṛita means. Roth explains the line to mean 'Add us to the number of the people of eternity, *i. e.* to the blessed.' But Sáyaṇa takes the word to mean nothing more than 'water;' while Grassmann takes it to mean 'long life' only. So also in VII. 76. 4, we have "They were the God's companions at the banquet, the ancient sages true to law eternal. The fathers found the light that lay in darkness, and with effectual words begot the dawn." Thus here the ancestors of the Ṛishis are spoken of, as being associated with the Gods as companions and friends: cf., also I. 154. 5. The last verse of VII. 59 also contains a prayer 'so may I be released from death, not reft of immortality'. But the character of the verse is highly suspicious and the verse also occurs in Vájasaneyi Saṁhitâ 6. 30. Thus in the Ṛigveda, there are no indications, whatsoever of the later doctrine of Nivṛitti or Renunciation. The Vedic Religion is all optimistic.

Though it is said above that the hymns of the Ṛigveda are all praises or prayers relating to sacrifices, still they are not liturgical nor sacrificial, in the sense in which Mantras of the Yajurveda are. Simplicity and sincerity are the dominating characteristics. Heart speaks to heart. The cold formalism and artificial elaborateness are missing.

The hymns of the Ṛigveda are all praises and prayers addressed to gods which are personifications of the powers of nature, a fact which has greatly con-

tributed to give a poetic colouring to them. The early dawn, the bright rising sun, continue to fill the Vedic Ṛishi with reverence and a sense of wonder, even after hundreds of years, since these natural forces were turned into gods. The singular interest and importance of the Vedic poetry and the vedic religion lies in this fact that these priest-poets, in their heart of hearts, are not mere technicians, but tense observers of the great facts and acts of nature, and worshippers of the powers whom they fancy at work in nature; and that in spite of the plenty of time which was more than enough to have stiffened all nature-worship into mere admiration, fear and adulation of personal gods, they had not generally become forgetful of the forces in nature from which sprang the gods, whether it be due to the vast impressiveness of India's nature, or to the highly poetic and sincere temperament of the Vedic Ṛishis, or to both. "Its fiercely glowing sun, its terrible yet life-giving monsoons, the snow-mountain giants of the north and its bewilderingly profuse vegetation could hardly fail to keep obtruding themselves as a revelation of the powers of the already existing gods."* Though the Vedic Ṛishis had made a great deal of advance in their spiritual conceptions and can not be regarded as mere beginners and primitive barbarians, still, all through this advancement, we can not lose sight of the first touch of nature. In their conception of Savitṛi, Indra and Varuṇa and of other gods, though the personification has advanced, no doubt, to an extent, sometimes quite sufficient to

* Bloomfield's Religion of the Vedas. p. 82.

make distinct personal gods of them, still we can see through these gods and can have an insight into their original from which they sprang. It is this transparency of the Vedic pantheon, which is a most surprising phenomenon. What may be called arrested personification is the very genius of the religion of the Rigveda.* Thus to take one instance, the god Savitri is described thus–'through the dusky firmament advancing, laying to rest the immortal and the mortal, borne in his golden chariot, Savitri cometh, who looks on every creature.'‡ So also the various myths connected with Indra, in the form in which they are found in the hymns of the Rigveda are quite transparent and their origin in natural phenomena can be clearly seen. Thus, as the Rishis of the Rigveda work their way slowly from the single and separate gods in the Rigveda to the later conception of the absolute one being or the idea of unity as finally settled in the Upanishads, they, all this while, with all their too human sordidness and all their natural fancifulness, seem to see the great realities of the world with their eyes wide open, whether it be the single and separate manifestations of nature as in the Rigveda, or nature as a whole as in later books. Thus, the hymns of the Rigveda most clearly teach the fact that mythology, properly speaking, "is the first and fundamental adjustment of the individual human life to the outer active, interfering, dynamic world, which surrounds

* Bloomfield. p. 85.

‡ Rigveda I. 35. 2.

and influences man from the moment when he opens his eyes upon the wonders of its unexplained phenomena."*

This arresting of personification in the Ṛigveda may be best realised by the student, by calling up another mythology, that of the Greeks. This is also based upon nature, but nature is soon forgotten, or if not entirely forgotten, much obscured by after-born movements. The personification there is too finished. Thus, Zeus whose eye sees all and knows all, who is the beginning, the middle, on whom all is founded, is at the same time, the flippant, breezy Jove to whom the poets ascribe foibles and vices barely excusable in a modern born-vivant, and man about town. Homicide without end, parricide and murder of children, are the stock events of their mythology. Thus we have a complete humanisation in Greek mythology. As opposed to this, many gods of the Veda are scarcely more than half persons, their other half, being an active force of nature.

What has been said so far about the gods of the Ṛigveda is, of course, generally true. For, there are a few cases such as the personification of the doors of the sacrificial chamber, of the sacrificial post, of the chariot and so on. But these are only exceptions and do not belong to the Ṛigveda proper.

One more trait of the Vedic Religion I have to notice before I take leave of this part of the subject and proceed to the consideration of the gods in parti-

* Bloomfield. p. 82.

cular. It is called Henotheism or Kathenotheism by several scholars. It consists in the tendency to raise the particular god to whom you are addressing prayers for the time being, to the most exalted and unsurpassed position, to whom all other gods are subordinate for the moment. This is done for most of the gods in turn. "The god in question, alone, is present to the mind of the singer; with him for the time being is associated everything that can be said of a divine being; he is the highest, the only god, before whom all others disappear, there being in this, however, no offence or depreciation of any other god."* Thus often times, it is not possible to distinguish one god from another owing to the similarity of attributes, though there can be marked out some attributes and functions which are distinctly characteristic of this or that god.

The gods are divided into three classes according to the regions or worlds they occupy. Yáska says—'The Etymologists opine that there are only three deities Agni on the earth, Váyu or Indra in the Antariksha or mid-air and Súrya in heaven. One and the same deity is called by several names, owing to the wondrous or miraculous powers which it possesses or because of the different functions it has to perform, corresponding to which it receives the different names or (it may be held) that there are as many different deities as there are names, because there are as many different prayers.' Yâska further discusses the question regarding the form of these gods, (अथ आकारचिन्तनं देवतानाम्) in the course of which he states three different views viz.

* Rigveda by Kaegi. p. 33.

that the gods have human forms, that they have not human forms and lastly that they have partly human forms and partly not. This very fact is a further proof in favour of the arrested personification spoken of above. Before I proceed to point out, the special attributes and functions of each god individually, I have to notice one fact and it is that the gods of the Ṛigveda substantially differ from those of the later Puráṇas. It is, no doubt, a very interesting subject to trace the character of every god from the times of the Ṛigveda down to the latest mythological works and to mark the differences which correspond to the different stages in the history of the Indian mind. Not only have the characters of the gods changed considerably even so far as to make them recognized with difficulty, but their mutual relations also have been altered immensely and he who was a very prominent and dominating god in the Veda has been reduced to a minor deity of little or no significance in the Puráṇas, and *vice versa*. Thus, Agni and Indra stand out most prominently in the Ṛigveda, and their importance is not shared by any other god; but in the Purâṇas, if they have not paled down into utter insignificance, at least they have been reduced to a comparative subordination, by the side of the triad, that has put every other god in the background though, no doubt, Indra continues to hold his position as a suzerain amongst the thirty three gods. The same is more strikingly true of Varuṇa, who in the Ṛigveda is the god of justice as it were, the lord in the moral domain, who watches the conduct of men and punishes them, but who, in the

Purâṇas, is merely a deity presiding over water, to whom no significance is attached whatsoever. On the other hand, Vishṇu illustrates the opposite phase of rising to prominence, from a position of comparative insignificance.

Moreover some new gods have found a place in the Puráṇas which were not at all known to the Ṛigveda. Thus Brahmadeva, and Śankara, Lakshmí and Párvatí, Kubera and Dattâtreya, are figures not at all known to the Ṛigveda. On the other hand, Ushas and Parjanya, Bhaga and Aryaman, have ceased to exist as deities, not to mention the fact that Savitṛi, Púshan, Mitra, Súrya who are so many different godheads with distinguishing characteristics have later on come to be mere synonyms, all signifying but one god.

The god that stands out most prominently in the whole of the Vedic pantheon, is Agni, only second to Indra in point of the number of hymns addressed. Agni is a most striking instance of what I have above referred to as arrested personification. It is both an element and a phenomenon and at the same time a person and a god. Though the word 'Agni' is Indo-European, in as much as Latin has '*ignis*', Lithuanian has '*ugnis*', old Slavic *Ogni*, still, God Agni, with all the diverse shapes it possesses, is, in every essential a product of the poet-priests of the Ṛigveda.

Agni is spoken of, under three forms, the Fire on earth, the Lightning in the atmosphere, and the Sun in the heaven. Agni is generated from the अरणि or the sacred fire-sticks which are often described as the mothers: cf. VII. I. I. and VII. 3.9. It is also described as

being generated by Indra between two clouds or produced from waters. It is very frequently described as the son of strength--'सहसः सनुः' 'ऊर्जोनपात' and so on, perhaps because of the strength or powerful exertion required for rubbing together the two sticks before fire is generated by friction therefrom.* Though Agni is none but the fire enkindled in every house every day, still its household aspect is not at all present to the mind of the Vedic Ṛishis. It is only the cosmic and ritualistic aspects that are mainly dealt with. Agni dispels darkness, frightens away the demons of the night, and heralds light. 'यो अपाचीने तमसि मदंतीः । प्राचीः चकार नृतम शचीभिः ॥ VII. 6. 4. Agni is ever young, because he is enkindled fresh every morning. He begins the sacrificial day. He is the oldest priest, is fed with ghee and rises into flames. He issues from the trees which he consumes, thus he is the eater of his mothers. He is bright-jawed (शुचिदन), with a head of light (तपुर्मूर्द्धा), with a face of ghee घृतप्रतीक, the lord of the people (विश्पते VII 15. 7), the lord of the house (गृहपतिः), VII 19. 2. He is the immortal domestic priest, concentrating in his own person all the sacrificial offices, (cf. VII-16. 5.). Not only is he the arch-priest, he is also the arch-sage (कविः VII. 15. 2), कविक्रतु and so on. Then the leap from an arch-priest and an arch-sage, to a Godhead is not difficult. He is the great God who is the messenger between gods and men. He hastens with his steeds and is often asked by the worshippers to bring the gods to the sacrifices or to convey the offer-

* Bloomfield, Religion of the Veda. p. 159.

ings to them, 'प्रियं चेतिष्ठं अरतिं स्वध्वरं। विश्वस्य दूतममृतम्॥ (VII. 16. 1).

Not only does Agni perform an important function from the sacrificial point of view, he also drives the दस्युs in the jungles and brings great booty to the Aryans: cf. VII.6.3

Agni is connected with the अंगिरस्‌s, who are often described as the seven priests who brought down Agni from the heavens or first enkindled him for man. In this connection must be also noticed मातरिश्वन a semi-divine being who like the Greek Prometheus was the first to introduce Agni to men on the earth. This myth may be nothing more than the fire of lightning generated from the clouds, and striking trees and plants, whose germ Agni is often described to be, given out when they catch fire.

Thus, we see that Agni is cosmic, ritualistic and divine, through all these stages, however, retaining its elemental or natural character, not allowing it to be obscured by rigid personification. There is one myth connected with Agni, which has been later developed into a neat story, by the Purāṇas. The function of carrying the oblations to gods was solely Agni's, so that it so happened that it became impossible for the gods, to subsist without him. Agni, however, got tired of his work of serving gods and men and concealed himself into the waters. But the god Yama discovered and betrayed him and Varuṇa, as the spokesman of gods at last induced Agni to resume his task of expediting the sacrifices to the gods. For this I may refer the student to hymns 51 and 52 of the 10th

Maṇḍala. This has been turned into a very neat story in the Mahábhárata.*

The next important god is Indra, to whom the largest number of hymns in the Ṛigveda Saṁhitá is addressed, almost one-fourth of the total number of hymns. It is not possible to say exactly what phenomenon of nature is represented by this god, because so many personal attributes are ascribed to him that we can not easily pierce through the god's personality. Thus he is an opaque god, as compared with the transparent Agni. Indra's name, however, occurs in the Avesta, as *Andra* where he is degraded to a demon. But his chief vedic epithet Vṛitrahan is the same name as that of the abstract genius of Victory '*Verethraghna*' in the Avesta, and the Armenian dragon-slayer '*Vahagn.*'‡

We may briefly sum up the attributes of the Vedic Indra as follows, from which it will be evident that the Vedic poet-priests exceeded themselves in lauding Indra, and that there was no high prowess whose credit could not be given to Indra.

Indra is born of the Heaven and the Earth (VII 20. 5), and he drank Soma as soon as he was born (VII. 98. 3.); Indra is ancient, youthful, strong, agile, martial, undecaying, all-conquering, lord of unbounded wisdom and of irresistible power. He has a beautiful chin, he wears a beautiful helmet (सुशिप्रः), has golden arms (हिरण्यबाहुः VII. 34. 4), a golden chariot, with green steeds (हरिताश्व). His horses

* (See Vanaparva Adh. 224; Salya. Adh. 48, verses 16 to 22.)

‡ Bloomfield, Religion of the Veda. p. 176.

are yoked by the power of prayers; his weapon is the thunderbolt; no one can equal him in his fondness for drinking Soma. Exhilarated by Soma, he slays the enemies and demons, (cf. VII. 22. 1, 2 and VII 29. 1). He, at a single draught drank the contents of thirty pails that were filled with Soma juice (VIII. 77. 4).*

In the company of Vishṇu, he encounters the hostile demons variously called by the names of वृत्र· अहि शुष्ण· नमुचि, शंबर· who shut up waters, and slayes them and liberates the waters (cf. VII. 99, 4 and 5.). He breaks the cities of the Asuras (पुरंदर:). Heaven and earth quake at the crash of his thunder. Indra is a terrible warrior, a gracious friend, a God whose shafts deal destruction to his enemies, while they bring deliverance and prosperity to his worshippers; VII. 27.3; 37. 3; 31-6. He is the most fatherly of fathers, has love and sympathy for mortals (VII. 23. 5). He controls the destinies of men, he is the enemy of the irreligious, a destroyer of the Dasyus and a protector of the Aryas.

Three principal traits stand out most prominently from amongst the highest divine functions and attributes ascribed to Indra. First, he is the god of physical power and dominion over the external world and he is not generally associated with the spiritual elevation and moral grandeur which is specially discernible in Varuṇa. In spite of his big personality, his essence and quality are that of lower, rather than higher religious conceptions. 'The coarse grain and the fleshli-

* Cf. Nirukta. V. 11 and the various interpretations of the fact given there. Read in this connection the hymn X. 119 which graphically describes the bragging of Indra under the influence of Soma.

ness of his character arrest very unfavourable attention. Indra embodies so completely the human qualities of brag and bluster, gluttony, drunkeness and lust, as to make him the peg upon which to hang scepticism."°

The second trait closely associated with this, is that Indra appears all through as the national hero of the invading Aryans, in their struggles against the dark-complexioned Dasyus whom they had to overcome and drive before them. VII. 18 and 32 are good illustrations of this idea. Indra's godhood is invoked not only in connection with the extermination of the Dasyus, but even in the case of mutual wars amongst the different clans. He is called the Lord of Strength, with whom heroic deeds are associated.

The third point to be noticed is his exploit over Vṛitra. The second verse of I. 32, runs thus :—'He slew the dragon who lay upon the mountain. God Tvashṭar forged for him his heavenly club. Like roaring cattle, down came the waters, flowing swiftly to the sea'. The same fact is recorded in verses 6 and 7 of the same hymn. Now what is meant by this slaughter of Vṛitra by Indra ? Who is Vṛitra ? Who is Indra ? what are these waters which were compassed by Vṛitra and which were afterwards liberated by Indra ?

Now several theories have been proposed to account for this. Even in Nirukta, the oldest available book on Vedic exegesis, more than one explanation are put forth. See, Nirukta II. 16 according to which, the credit of suggesting the storm-theory must be

° Bloomfield, Religion of the Veda. p. 174.

given to the school of the Nairuktas. According to this storm-theory, वृत्र is the malignant, evil spirit *i. e.* the cloud which has held fast the waters, towards the end of the summer and the advent of the rainy season and Indra is none but the god of rain, who pierces through the cloud and causes the waters to flow forth and shower themselves down on the earth. In this interpretation, the पर्वत or गिरि into which the waters were confined has to be understood to be a cloud. There are other places also in the Ṛigveda, where the word पर्वत is generally understood to be a cloud, *e. g.* I. 19. 7—'य ईङ्खयन्ति पर्वतान् तिरः समुद्रमर्णवम्' where the अर्णव समुद्र is nothing but the अन्तरिक्ष, *i. e.* the middle world between पृथिवी on the one hand and द्यौः on the other ; and पर्वतान् are the clouds. Sáyaṇa also takes here पर्वतान् =मेघान्. On this Max Müller notes that "in old Norse *Klakkr* means both cloud and rock ; nay, the English word cloud itself has been identified with the Anglo-Saxon *clud*, rock." This storm-theory is followed by most of the Western scholars including Max Müller who is responsible for carrying this theory too far. But there are several objections to it.

Generally wherever this exploit over Vṛi is mentioned, several other things are associated with it. Let us take the typical verse—II. 19. 3--where it is stated that Indra, the dragon-slayer, set in motion the flood of waters of the sea, generated the sun and found the cows. Now all these three phenomena can not be accounted for by the above theory. So the dawn theory is put forth. Indra is the sun exterminating nocturnal darkness and pouring floods of light for the world

of living beings. The rays of the sun may be the cows. This, however, only explains a part; and 'there appears to be a confusion between the notion of the restoration of the sun after the darkness of the thunderstorm, and the recovery of the sun from the darkness of the night at dawn*' says Prof. Macdonell, which is nothing but admitting our inability to explain the myth satisfactorily.

Besides there may be raised several other objections against the storm and dawn-theory. Thus the fact that there is in the Veda another god पर्जन्य, the real storm and rain god, throws suspicion over Indra as the god of storm and rain. Besides in several places it is distinctly stated that Indra caused the rivers to flow to the sea from the mountains which were cleft by him. Now, sufficient reasons have not been pointed out why पर्वत should mean 'a cloud' and rivers, 'the flow of rain.'

Thus a third theory is proposed by Prof. Hillebrandt‡. According to this theory, the waters are those of rivers and mountain-streams; their confiner is the frozen winter, when the rivers are at their lowest level,—conceived as a winter-monster by the name of वृत्र or the confiner, who holds captive the rivers on the heights of glacier-mountains; and thus Indra is no other than the spring or summer sun, who frees them from the clutches of the winter-dragon. This may be called, for convenience' sake, the vernal theory.§

* Macdonell, 'Vedic Mythology' p. 61.

‡ Hillebrandt. 'Vidische Mythologie.' Vol. III. p. 157.

§ Bloomfield —'Religion'—p. 179.

But this phenomenon would be worth the name, only in extremely northern countries, so as to be represented by the fierce and obstinate contest between Indra and Vṛitra, as is described in the Ṛigveda.

But against all these theories there revolts one passage, II. 12. 11—'यः शंबरं पर्वतेषु क्षियन्तं चत्वारिंश्यां शरद्यन्वविन्दत। ओजायमानं यो अहिं जघान दानुं शयानं स जनास इन्द्रः ॥' Here it is said that Indra found out the demon lying in the mountains, and the time of the commencement of the contest is evidently given in the words 'चत्वारिंश्यां शरदि' which has been so far translated by Vedic scholars as 'in the fortieth year'. That शरद् may mean 'a year' since the year began with the शरद् season in Vedic times as is proved from several indications, we need not question. That the construction according to which चत्वारिंश्यां is adj. loc. sing. of the ordinal qualifying शरदि which is a word of the feminine gender, is grammatically unobjectionable, goes without doubt. But no one has explained what is meant by the fortieth year or fortieth autumn. Does it mean that the phenomenon represented by the Vṛitra myth, took place once in forty years ? The suggestions that the passage may refer to a famine or drought that occurred after forty years or that it may represent a forty years' war between the Aryans protected by Indra and Śambara, the chief of the aboriginal races dwelling on the mountains, have to be dismissed as being too far-fetched, and imaginary.

Hence a new interpretation is put on the myth by Mr. B. G. Tilak, based on his theory of the reminiscences of the Arctic Home of the Aryans, in the Ṛigveda.

According to this interpretation, the passage refers to the annual struggle between light and darkness, because in the polar or circum-polar regions, there is the long night of six months and the long day of six months, of course having a comparatively long twilight at both the ends. The waters are the cosmic waters which were supposed to surround the earth just like ether, in the world of light above and the world of darkness below; which caused the sun, the moon and the stars to move with them. If these waters therefore ceased to flow, the consequences were very serious; for the sun, the moon, the stars, would then all cease to rise and the world would be plunged in darkness. Thus we can fully understand the magnitude of the mischief worked by Vṛitra by stopping the flow of these waters.* The mountains into which these waters were put up may be some metaphorical mountains supposed to exist on the border of the nether world and this earth, just as, for instance, the sun is supposed to rise from the Meru-mountain. Thus the conflict with Vṛitra commenced in Śarad, the beginning of the long night, and ended at the end of the night or the year (cf. X. 62. 2. where the Angirasas, the assistants of Indra in his conquest of the cows, are said to have defeated Vala, at the end of the year परिवत्सरे). I may sum up the interpretation in the words of the author himself thus:—§'If India is described as the leader or releaser of waters (अपां नेता or अपां स्रष्टा), the waters do

* Tilak—Arctic Home. p. 269.

§ Tilak-Arctic Home. p. 295.

not mean the waters in the clouds but the waters or the watery vapours which fill the universe and form the material out of which the latter was created. In other words, the conquest over waters was something far more marvellous and cosmic in character than the mere breaking up of the clouds in the rainy season; and under these circumstances, it was naturally considered to be the greatest of Indra's exploits, when, invigorated by a hundred nightly Soma-sacrifices, he slew with ice the watery demon of darkness, shattered his hundred autumnal forts, released the waters of the seven rivers upstream to go along their ærial way, and brought out the sun and the dawn, or the cows from their place of confinement inside the rocky caves where they had stood still since the date of the war.'

LECTURE IX.

RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY OF RIGVEDA.

(*Continued*).

Varuṇa associated with the spiritual domain—The preserver of Ṛita or moral order—the three aspects of Ṛita—Mitra and Varuṇa, Ahura and Mithra—Greek Ouranos—Varuṇa, a god of waters—The Aśvins—their mythical and legendary character-marriage of Sûryá—Legends explained by the dawn and spring theories—the Arctic theory—Aśvins and Dioscuri—Their comparative insignificance in later mythology—the five solar gods—Savitṛi, the enlivening aspect of the sun—Sûrya, the luminary—Mitra, the Beneficent—Púshan, the god of paths—Vishṇu—his three strides—various interpretations of the same—the name *Sipivishta*—Ushas, the most graceful creation of Vedic poetry—The long and many dawns—VII. 76. 3.—The philosophy of Rigveda—The progress from many gods to one being—I. 164.—Ideas about death and the world hereafter—X. 121.—X. 90.—the creation hymn—Absence of pessimism.

Next we proceed to consider Varuṇa who is purely a Vedic god, i. e. a god occupying a very prominent place in the Ṛigveda but reduced to absolute insignificance in later mythology. The sphere of Varuṇa is quite opposed to that of Indra. The latter is associated with the domain of physical valour and command of external nature, but the former is principally concerned with the spiritual domain. Thus in the hymn VII. 83

addressed to Indra and Varuṇa conjointly, we have in verse 9 the functions of Indra and Varuṇa mentioned side by side, so as to bring out the contrast clearly—

'वृत्राण्यन्यः समिथेषु जिघ्नते व्रतान्यन्यो अभिरक्षते सदा।'

Moral elevation and sanctity are the principal attributes of Varuṇa. Omniscience and undeceivableness are frequently spoken of Varuṇa. Varuṇa stands out as the god of justice, watching the conduct of all people and setting his spies everywhere for the purpose. He controls the destinies of mankind, and beholds all the secret things, that have been and will be done. He seizes and punishes transgressors with his bonds or nooses; he is a barrier against the irreligious and the wicked; sinning mortals can hardly expect to escape him (VII. 65. 3.). He watches or witnesses the truth and falsehood of people. 'सत्यानृते अवपश्यन् जनानाम्' (VII. 49. 3). His laws and ordinances are in no case to be violated, and we see the worshipper often approaching Varuṇa in a suppliant attitude, pleading innocence and putting forth excuses for the sins if any and entreating him to show mercy, full of a contrite spirit as he is. With all the awe and reverence which Varuṇa commands and inspires, there is at the same time, the element of homeliness and mercy; and the relations between Varuṇa and his worshipper are often described as being very intimate. The worshipper is often like a little child committing offences through ignorance or temptation too strong for its weak and puerile nature and again obstinately asking for indulgence at the hands of the parent, *i. e.* Varuṇa.

The hymn VII. 86 is a typical hymn in this connection as it depicts Varuṇa as a guardian of moral order, angry at the misdeeds of men.

Varuṇa is visible to the mental eye of his worshippers (VII. 88. 2.). He is mighty and fixed in purpose, arrayed in a golden mail, surrounded by his messengers. His house has a thousand doors (VII. 88.5), he is foresighted and thousand-eyed (VII. 34. 10); he has the sun for his eye (VII. 66. 10); he is the king of all that exists (VII. 87. 6), a universal monarch, a self-dependent ruler. Power, martial strength and sovereign authority are also spoken of as belonging to Varuṇa. He is called असुर (mighty), मायी (VII 28. 4.), possessed of a mystic or miraculous power; Varuṇa is a god of illimitable resources and knowledge.

Here may be considered the meaning of the word ऋत in the Ṛigveda. Varuṇa is always spoken of as the preserver of ऋत, or as the spring of ऋत, (II. 28. 5. खा ऋतस्य)–This word ऋत in the Ṛigveda itself seems to denote three ideas, all allied with each other or one idea under three aspects owing to the difference of domains.

1st of all ऋत represents 'the cosmic order.'* ऋत rules the world and nature. The regular recurrence of the natural phenomena, the rising and setting of the sun, the coming of dawns and so on are all regulated by ऋत. The gods themselves are described as born of the ऋत, as observing and loving ऋत (e. g, ऋतजात ऋतज्ञ, ऋतयु etc.). Also ऋतायन् VII. 87. 1.

* See Bloomfield 'Religion' p. 126. 129

From this, ऋत comes to denote the correctness and regularity of the cult of god-worship or sacrifice. There is some principle, which guides and regulates the different events of the sacrifice, the coming of gods, the offering of oblations and so on and that is ऋत. Thus the sacrifices are described as conducted by ऋत as opposed to the magic rites and acts of witchcraft which may be, therefore, called अनृत.

Last comes the third phase in the domain of the moral conduct of man. The moral law which every righteous man must observe,--it is the chief function of Varuṇa to see that it is so observed--is called ऋत which may be thus paraphrased by सत्य and अनृत would then mean असत्य.

Though the world of Varuṇa is chiefly the moral world, still no mean exploits in the world of nature are ascribed to him. Varuṇa fashioned and upholds heaven and earth (VII. 86. 1; VII. 87. 5; VII. 87. 6.). He made the sun to shine and followed out channels for rivers. He knew the flight of birds in the sky, the path of ships on the ocean, and the course of the far-travelling wind.

Varuṇa is very frequently associated with Mitra and there are several hymns in Ṛigveda where Mitra and Varuṇa are addressed together. (cf. VII. 64 & 65). Mitra is of course the sun in his beneficent aspect the god of day or light, and what can Varuṇa be but the god of darknesss or night? Thus while commenting on VII. 87. 1 Sáyaṇa remarks 'अस्तं गच्छन् सूर्य एव वरुण इत्युच्यते। स हि स्वगमनेन रात्रीर्जनयति।'.

It is this very association of Mitra and Varuṇa, which has led Prof. Oldenberg to conjecture that Varuṇa should be the moon in contrast with Mitra who is the sun.

But according to most of the scholars, Varuṇa is connected with the chief good and wise god of the Zoroastrian faith viz. *Ahura Mazd* or *Ormazd* 'wise lord'. One reason for this connection if not identification is that Ahura corresponds with Asura which is a title frequently applied to Varuṇa, though it must be remembered here, that many other gods in the Ṛigveda are called 'Asura' (lit. strong). The second and convincing reason is the dual partnership of Ahura and Mithra in the Avesta which exactly corresponds to that of Mitra and Varuṇa in the Veda. Besides the attributes and functions of Ahura Mazd are very similar to those of Varuṇa. Thus in the Zoroastrian system, Ahura Mazd orders the world and assigns to all good creatures and entities their respective places and activities. Ahura creates the divine order (*i. e.* Asha which corresponds to the Vedic Ṛita, and note that Ahura is called Ashahe Kháo which exactly corresponds to *Khá Ṛitasya*, in connection with Varuṇa in the Veda.). He made a way for the sun and the stars. As a guardian of divine order Ahura is not to be deceived and so on. This is enough to establish the great similarity between Ahura Mazd and Varuṇa.

Varuṇa, however, belongs not only to the Indo—Iranian period but to the Indo--European period, in as much as Varuṇa corresponds to the Greek *Ouranos*, on whose testimony Varuṇa should represent probably the

encompassing sky. Thus in Ṛigveda VIII. 41. 3. Varuṇa is described as embracing the all. वरुण may be derived from the root वृ to cover and thus may mean the sky that covers or pervades all.

One more point I would touch, before taking leave of Varuṇa, and it is his later conception as a god of water. No doubt, Varuṇa is connected with water even in the Ṛigveda. In VII. 87. 1, Varuṇa has not only cut out a pathway for the sun, but has led the watery floods of rivers onwards. In VII. 64. 2, मित्र and वरुण are called सिन्धुपती—'lords of streams or rivers.' In VII. 49. 3 Varuṇa is described as the sovereign of waters going amidst them. This connection with water (which really is only one particular aspect or manifestation of the ऋत of which वरुण is the lord), may have probably led to the later conception in the Purāṇas and even Sáyaṇa calls him 'जलाभिमानिना देवता' while commenting on VIII. 58. 2, though generally he regards Varuṇa as the god of night. "When, on the one hand, the conception of Varuṇa as the all-embracing heaven, had been established, and on the other hand, the observation of the rivers flowing towards the ends of the earth, and to the sea had led to the conjecture that there existed an ocean enclosing the earth in its bosom,* then the way was thoroughly prepared for connecting Varuṇa with the ocean, in later mythology".‡

* Or it may be the ocean of ærial waters which made the sun and the moon to move, to rise and to set—(cf. ऋत).

‡ Muir 'Original Sanskrit Texts' V.

Next we come to the pair of gods, the Aśvins (horsemen). Hymns 67 to 74 of the 7th Maṇḍala are all addressed to these gods. The character of these two deities is, however, very little defined, though they are no doubt, an object of a very enthusiastic worship. They are the sons of Vivaswat and Saraṇyu. They are often called 'sons of heaven' (दिवोनपाता). They are physicians, asked to neglect the calls of other devotees and pass from house to house partaking of Soma. They come from a distance in a golden chariot, drawn by birds or bird-like horses. They are ancient, beautiful, bright, swifter than thought, possessed of wisdom and intelligence.

Of all the Vedic divinities the Aśvins have the most pronounced mythical and legendary character. A maiden by the name of Súryá (i. e. daughter of the sun) is captivated by the youthful beauty of the Aśvins, chooses them for her husbands and ascends their chariot. The most prominent characteristic of the Aśvins is, however, that they are the most reliable helpers in need. All sorts of men and women have appealed to them for aid and have not been disappointed. The Aśvins had made themselves so familiar with men that the gods had refused to admit them to a share in the sacrifice. This fact has led some people to conjecture that these Aśvins must have been two heroes of wondrous exploits and of unparalleled beneficent activity, so much so that they were afterwards deified and became the recipients of most hearty praise.

It would be interesting to know what Yáska thinks of them. In the beginning of Ch. 12 he says,

'Some say that they are heaven and earth ; others, day and night, others again, sun and moon.' (All these are explanations according to the Nairukta school or the naturalists). The Aitihásikas (Traditionalists) say that they are two kings of virtuous deeds. Yáska also remarks that their time is the hour between midnight and early dawn.

As said above, it is not easy to exactly define their character from the epithets applied to them. But let us see if we derive some help in this from a considera-tion of the several legends connected with them. They have been all briefly summarised in the following extract from Prof. Macdonell's Vedic Mythology (§ 21) which I quote here for convenience.* "The sage Chyavána, grown old and deserted, they released from his decre-pit body; they prolonged his life, restored him to youth, rendered him desirable to his wife, and made him the husband of maidens (I. 116. 10 etc.). They also renewed the youth of the aged Kali and befriended him when he had taken a wife (I. 112. 15.).........But the story most often referred to, is that of the rescue of Bhujyu, son of Tugra, who was abandoned in the midst of the ocean (समुद्रे), or in the water clouds (उदमेघे) and who, tossed about in darkness, invoked the aid of the youthful heroes. In the ocean which is without support (अनारम्भणे) they took him home in a hundred—oared ship (शतारित्रम्—I. 116. 5). They rescued him with animated water-tight ships.......The sage Rebha,

*For Aśvins, I have to recommend to the student hymns 112,116, 117, 118 from the 1st Mandala.

stabbed, bound, hidden by the malignant, overwhelmed in waters for ten nights and nine days, abandoned as dead, was by the Aśvins, revived and drawn out, as Soma juice is raised with a ladle. (I. 116. 24; I. 112. 5). They delivered Vandana from his calamity and restored him to the light of the sun......They succoured the sage Atri Saptavadhri, who was plunged in a burning pit by the wiles of a demon, and delivered him from darkness (I. 116. 8; VI. 50. 10). They rescued from the jaws of a wolf, a quail (वर्तिका) who invoked their aid. (I. 112. 8). To Ṛijráśva, who had been blinded by his cruel father for killing one hundred and one sheep and giving them to a she-wolf to devour, they restored his eye-sight, at the prayer of the she-wolf (I. 116. 16; I. 117. 17.); and cured Parávṛij of blindness and lameness. (I. 112. 8.) When Viśpalá's leg had been cut off in the battle like the wing of a bird, the Aśvins gave her an iron one instead (I. 116. 15).........The cow of Śayu which had left off bearing, they caused to give milk (I. 116.22); and to Pedu they gave a strong, stiff, dragon-slaying steed impelled by Indra, which won him unbounded spoils (I. 116. 6)."

Now all these myths connected with the Aśvins have been explained by the dawn and the spring theories. Thus the recovery of the sun early in the morning, from the darkness of the night, and the restoring of brightness to the sun, in the spring, whose powers are mostly decayed in winter are the phenomena supposed to be referred to by these legends of restoring youth to an old man or curing the blindness of another. But these theories can not fully explain all the details

connected with these legends. Thus, for instance, the places from which all the helpless persons are rescued are generally described as full of darkness, as being bottomless and watery (I. 182. 6); and the period of distress is generally spoken of as being 10 days or 10 days and 10 nights and so on. Besides the incident of ऋज्राश्व (I. 116. 16) killing 100 sheep and therefore being rendered blind remains altogether without explanation. So also the hymn 78 of M. V, referring to Atri Saptavadhri and especially its last three verses can not be satisfactorily explained on the basis of the two theories proposed above. Hence, another theory briefly called the Arctic theory is proposed, according to which all these legends refer to the long night and the long day. 'The sun sunk in the nether world of waters and darkness and not merely a winter sun is the burden of all these legends, and the achievements of the Aśvins refer to the rescue of the sun from the dark pit of the nether world or from the bottomless ocean of darkness.'*

The Aśvins and Súryá have been identified or at least connected with the Greek Dioscuri, 'the sons of Zeus' Castor and Pollux, and their sister Helena (which more resembles in sound, Saraṇyu the mother of the Aśvins). The word Aśvin means 'one having a horse'; but this connection with horses comes out more strongly with the Dioscuri, who are celebrated tamers of horses, riders of horses, and charioteers. They

---

* Tilak, Arctic Home. p. 319.

also were revered as helpers in need and were called Anaktes 'protecting lords.'*

Thus, we see that the Vedic Aśvins combined the cosmical as well as historical and human characters, in a most couspicuous way. In later mythology, they occupy an insignificant position merely being physicians possessed of great physical beauty also. The legend of Chyavána referred to above, has been transformed into a neat story in the Mahábhárata.‡

Next we have to consider the five solar gods viz., सवितृ, सूर्य, मित्र, पूषन्, and विष्णु. Though many of the attributes of these gods are very similar so as to make it difficult to distinguish one from another, still there are some distinctive functions peculiar to each of them and there is no doubt that in the Ṛigveda these are not mere synonyms, but distinct entities.

सवितृ (lit. the impeller, the enlivener) represents in distinction from others, the enlivening or quickening aspect of the sun. In this connection I recommend, the hymn IV. 54, of which every verse contains some form of the root सु in its various meanings, thus reminding the reader of the essential connection between the god सवितृ and the meaning of the root present in it. Savitri is gold-complexioned, he ascends a golden car, beholds all creatures. This सवितृ is sometimes expressly distinguished from सूर्य ; but sometimes they are spoken of indiscriminately. Sáyaṇa says in one place that the

* Bloomfield, Relig. p. 113. 114.

‡ About the birth of the Aśvins and their relation to Vasishtha see the extract from बृहद्देवता quoted by Sâyaṇa in his commentary on VII. 72. 2.

sun is called सवितृ, before rising, and सूर्य, from sunrise to sunset. Yáska remarks--"The time of Savitṛi's appearance is when darkness has been removed and the rays of light have become diffused over the sky."

सूर्य more refers to the luminary itself. He is the son of द्यौः and अदिति; his wife is उषस् (VII. 75. 5). In another place the dawns are said to produce him (VII. 78.3). He is drawn in a car by seven horses (VII. 63. 2); his path is prepared by the आदित्यs (VII. 60. 4); Sùrya is the preserver and soul of all things stationary and moving (VII. 60. 2); he is the vivifier of men (VII. 63.2). He is far-seeing, he beholds the good and bad deeds of all mortal creatures, he is the eye of मित्र and वरुण. In many places, however, a dependent and subordinate position is assigned to सूर्य, and his divine personality is thrown into the background. The grand luminary becomes little more than a part of nature, created and controlled by those spiritual powers which exist above and beyond all material phenomena. The sun is thus one of the most transparent of gods. Hymn, I. 115 may give a good idea of the godhead of Súrya.

मित्र was spoken of above as an associate of वरुण. He prominently represents the beneficent side of the Sun's power. मित्र sets people to activity, he holds fast the earth and heaven, he watches the people ceaselessly. Hymn III. 59 is specially addressed to मित्र alone, wherein चर्षणिधृत and यातयज्जन are his distinctive epithets. It is to be noted that this is the only hymn addressed to Mitra alone, in the whole of Ṛigveda. Elsewhere he is generally invoked along with Varuṇa. Thus it may be said that Mitra, though one of the old-

est gods, owing to his identification with the Iranian Mithra, has lost his independent individuality in the Ṛigveda.

पूषन् is distinctly a shepherd god. "His chief claim* to usefulness is that he knows the roadways; protects from their dangers such as wolves and robbers; guards cattle so that they be not dashed to pieces in the ravine; brings them home unhurt, when they have gone astray, and, in general, restores lost things. Púshan drives the cows to pasture,...he carries a goad and his car is drawn by goats,...he lives on gruel," Hymns 53-56 of Maṇḍala VI. may be read in this connection. This पूषन् also can not be anything but a sun-god; since he is also described as lord of all things that stand or move and he is also the lover of सूर्या. He is called आघृणि 'glowing'; so also his ability as a path-finder and restorer of lost things points to an over-seeing heavenly body.

विष्णु is another solar deity in the Ṛigveda. The entire hymns and the separate verses in which Vishṇu is celebrated are much fewer than those dedicated to the praises of Indra, Agni, Varuṇa, Aśvins etc. Besides, in most of the passages referring to him, he is generally lauded along with a host of other divinities. From this it may be concluded that Vishṇu was regarded in the Ṛigveda as being on a footing of equality with other gods, or even subordinate to many of them, though he forms one of the two great gods of modern Hinduism, sometimes being elevated to the highest place. The essential feature of his character is that

* Bloomfield, Religion. p. 170.

he takes three strides covering the three worlds. Śákapúṇi regards these three strides as three manifestations of one and the same god, as Agni on earth, as Indra or Váyu in the atmosphere and as the sun in heaven. Aurṇavábha, on the other hand, interprets them as the rising, culminating and setting of the sun. Max Müller also interprets this myth as referring to the three stages in the daily course of the sun. In the Brâhmaṇas and later works, however, this feature is developed into the story of Vishṇu appearing in the form of a dwarf and recovering the earth from the demons headed by Bali, by taking his three strides.

According to Mr. Tilak's theory, however, these three strides can not refer to the daily course of the sun, but to the annual course when the year was divided, as at the circumpolar regions, into three parts, of which two parts or eight months, the sun was above the horizon and hence the two strides of Vishṇu are spoken of as being visible; while the third part or four months, the sun went below the horizon into the nether world of darkness or of waters, providing continuous darkness, and thus the third stride is invisible. In I. 155. 6, Vishṇu is described as setting into motion his ninety steeds with four names, which can only refer to the 360 days of the year with the four seasons. So also in VII. 99, verses 4 and 5, Vishṇu is associated with Indra, in the exploit over Vritra, and Vishṇu is described along with Indra as generating the sun, the dawn, and Agni, and breaking the ninety-nine cities of Śambara—which points to the conclusion that the three strides of Vishṇu should

also refer to the annual course of the sun, with the long day and long night.

With this interpretation, the meaning of the word शिपिविष्ट may be well explained. The verse VII. 100. 6 runs thus—'What was there to be blamed in thee when thou declaredst "I am Śipivishṭa"? Do not conceal from us this form, since thou didst assume another shape in the battle.' Yâska (Nír. V. 7-9), proposes two interpretations, one bad, following Aupamanyava and the other, good. शिपिविष्ट may mean 'शेप इव निर्वेष्टितः' 'enveloped like the private parts or with rays obscured' (अप्रतिपन्नरश्मिः). It may be a laudatory appellation also, meaning 'one whose rays (शिपयः) are displayed' (आविष्टाः)

शिपिविष्ट refers to the temporary obscuring of the rays of the sun when he entered into the nether world (रजसःपराके क्षियन्तं VII. 100. 5.). 'The poet, therefore asks Vishṇu not to be ashamed of this epithet, because says he, the form indicated by the bad name is only temporarily assumed as a dark armour for the purpose of fighting with the Asuras, and as it was no longer needed, Vishṇu is invoked to reveal his true form to the worshipper.' * Thus the story of Bali and Vâmana is the story of Vishṇu going down to the nether world dark or diseased,§ to plant his third step on the head of the Asuras, or in a dark armour to help Indra in his struggle for waters and light, a struggle which lasted for a long time and resulted in the flowing of waters,

* Tilak—Arctic Home—p. 332.

§ शिपिविष्ट indicated some bodily affliction or skin-disease, though what it was exactly is not known.

the recovery of the dawn, and the coming out of the sun in a bright armour, after a long and continuous darkness.

Sâyaṇa generally derives विष्णु as व्यापनशील, but Prof. Bloomfield has proposed a new etymology—वि+स्नु 'through the back' on the ground of a passage in the Sâma-veda (2. 1024) 'यतो विष्णुर्विचक्रमे पृथिव्या अधि सानवि' 'Vishṇu strode through over the back of the earth.'

Some other acts of a high character are also attributed to Vishṇu. He is said to have established heaven and earth, to contain all the world in his strides, to have made the atmosphere wide, stretched out the worlds. His greatness is described in one place as having no limit within the ken of present or future beings. 'In the highest stepping place of Vishṇu, there is the fount of honey' (I. 154. 5).

Nothing can surpass the beauty of the hymns addressed to the goddess Ushas; and as Macdonell remarks, this deity is the most graceful creation of Vedic poetry, there being no more charming figure in the descriptive religious lyrics of any other literature.* The 7th Maṇḍala contains seven hymns (75 to 81) out of the twenty hymns addressed to Ushas in the whole of the Ṛigveda. The freshness and sweetness about these poems is simply indescribable. While reading such verses as "Lo, the rich dawn casts, as it were, her garment from her, and moves on, queen of the world: this beautiful and wonderful goddess brings heaven to life again and stretches to the ends of earth and sky."

* Macdonell's Vedic Mythology. p. 46.

(III. 61. 4), we feel as if we are going to be held willing captives of a primitive Shelley or Keats.

The Dawn is the daughter of the sky, and sister of the night. The sun is her lover. The glorious mistress of the world is borne on a shining chariot, drawn by ruddy horses, like a richly dressed dancing girl, she goes on smiling and confiding in the irresistible power of her attractions, unveiling her bosom to the gaze of the beholder. She dispels darkness, disclosing the treasures she had concealed, illuminates the world, awakens the five races of men, she is young, being born again and again, yet old and immortal, she is the life and breath of all. Even in this most ecstatic piece of poetry concerning the Dawn, the Vedic poet-priest can not lay aside his trait of practicalness and the sacrific-cult. The Dawn is the herald of the sacrifice, with her appearance commences the sacrificial day, as it were, and she is often entreated to bring to the worshipper wealth, children, slaves etc., to afford protection and to prolong life. The Dawn is thus another instance of a transparent god, whose natural character is not in the least obscured by personification.

Can it be the diurnal dawn, which could excite such ecstacy and rapture in the mind of the Vedic poet-priest? Of course, every one is aware of the fresh and sweet influence of the early dawn, which may deserve the poetic imagery, all that is said about her in the Veda. But there are certain phrases and expressions which are used of her and which can not be satisfactorily interpreted as referring to the daily dawn. The

long, continuous dawns, (VII. 76. 3; II. 28. 9; VII. 9, 1; VII. 63. 3.) so much so, that even the whole of the Ṛigveda could be recited before sunrise, the circular movement referred to, (I. 123. 8. and 9; III. 61. 3; VII 80. 1.) the thirty parts of which they were made up (I. 123. 8; VI. 59. 6), all these go to show that the dawns referred to must be longer dawns possible at the circumpolar regions.*

Before taking leave of this subject, we may consider the interpretation of the following verses in the 7th Maṇḍala, bearing upon the subject.‡

"तानीदहानि बहुलान्यासन या प्राचीनमुदिता सूर्यस्य। यतः परि जार इवाचरंती उषो दद्दक्षे न पुनर्यतीव" VII 76. 3. The verse means—' Those days were many which were aforetime at the rise of the sun and about which, oh dawn, thou wast seen moving on, as towards a lover, and not like one (woman) who forsakes,' which clearly establishes two facts that (1) many days passed between the appearance of the first morning beams and sunrise; and that (2) those days were faithfully attended by the Dawn which is possible only in the case of the circumpolar dawn.

Sáyaṇa explains the verse in a farfetched manner, not understanding how several days could pass before sunrise and hence proposes to take the word अहन् to mean उषःप्रकाशयुक्तकाल and तानि= splendours and बहुलानि अहानि accusative of time. Other western scholars also take अहानि as splendours, lustres. Griffith translates 'great is the number of mornings,' but does not explain

* Tilak's Arctic Home—p. 108, 109.

‡ Tilak—'Arctic home'—p. 88 ff.

how it is possible. So also III. 61. 3 and VII. 80. 1 may deserve special consideration, in this connection.

So far I have spoken of the mythology of the Ṛigveda. Before concluding, I should like to make in this place, a few remarks on the philosophy of the Ṛigveda.

India is often spoken of as the cradle of philosophy. Nowhere are made so bold and daring attempts to solve the riddle of the universe as in India, where there lived kings like Janaka and Ajátaśatru, Bráhmaṇas like Yájñavalkya and Nachiketas, scholiasts like Śankara and Kumárila. So the student of Ṛigveda will naturally be curious to know what philosophy is taught by the Ṛigveda. He has, however, to be warned that no cut and dry system is taught here, for which he has to go to the Sútras. Nor do philosophic speculations form the main burden of the Ṛigveda as they do in the case of the Upanishads. However, the seeds of the Upanishad thought are seen scattered about here and there in the Samhitá of the Ṛigveda. Though the general religion of the Ṛigveda refers to a plurality of nature gods, still the tendency to monism is distinctly seen in some of the hymns. Just as the Ṛishis thought that the several natural phenomena had some divine forces behind them, which were personified into so many gods, in the same way they advanced one step further and came to think that all these were the aspects of one and the same all-pervading divine force which manifested itself into the different phenomena. Thus, there was a transition from many gods to one god. Thus in I. 164.

46 we have--"They call it, Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa and Agni, or the heavenly bird Garutmat (the sun). The sages call the one being in many ways; they call it Agni, Yama, Mátariśvan." Here the several Vedic gods are stated to be but one being. This whole hymn (I. 164) is nothing but a collection of fifty-two verses of poetry, all of them except one, being riddles whose answers are not given. "The subjects of these riddles are cosmic, that is, pertaining to the nature phenomena of the universe; mythological, that is, referring to the accepted legends about the gods; psychological that is, pertaining to the human organs and sensations or finally crude and tentative philosophy or theosophy. Heaven and Earth, Sun and Moon, air, clouds and rain; the course of the sun, the year, the seasons, months, days and nights; human voice, self-consciousness, life and death; the origin of the first creature, and the originator of the universe—such are the abrupt and bold themes" *

How the thought progressed from many gods to one being or from the simple give-take religion, to such abstruse speculations can be explained in some such way as follows. It was at the sacrifice that the tendency of philosophising must have first grown and prospered. The various phases of the sacrifice, the various implements and little acts must have been subjects of speculations mystic and theosophic in character. The mere technic of the sacrificial ritual, in the course of time, must have ceased to satisfy the minds both of the patron and the priest, so that more philoso-

Bloomfield, Religion—p. 218.

phic food was required, thus questions and answers regarding the origin of man and similar topics must have been discussed between them, giving rise to what are called Brahmodyas. So also the old mythological gods in strong flesh tints must have begun to disconcert them and faith must have been gradually lost. So that abstract and symbolic embodiments of the divine idea then took the place of the gods of nature. The ideas of the nature above described are scattered about here and there even in the midst of the oldest portions, so that it may be asserted with truth, that there is no period whatever when such questions as 'whence I come ?' 'who I am?' 'what is the origin of this visible world with all its plurality?' ceased to occupy the Vedic Ṛishis.

In spite of the worldly character of the rewards, asked for by the Vedic Ṛishis, such as, long life, cattle, warlike sons, gold and so on, sometimes there seem to be haunting their minds, ideas about death and the world thereafter. The idea that the dead forefathers after death are dwelling in a world, in the company of gods, where we ourselves shall have to go after death, seems to be expressed or implied in several places. Thus we have in I. 91. 1 'under your guidance, oh Indra, our wise fathers received their share of treasure among the gods'—so also I. 125. 5. The thirst for life haunts the mind of the Ṛishi and he leads himself to believe that the life after death in the world of gods and fathers, is eternal, at least as compared with the life in this earth. Thus in V. 55. 4, V. 63. 2, that life is called अमृतत्व or immortality.

Questions concerning the beginning and origin of all things were asked and answered in a crude and tentative manner by the Vedic Ṛishis. Thus in the hymn X. 121, हिरण्यगर्भ is described as existing in the beginning of the creation, the sole Lord of beings, supporting heaven and earth. In X. 90, the hymn popularly known as पुरुषसूक्त, the idea that the whole world is one being, the विराट्पुरुष who having pervaded the world from all sides, still remained over and above it, is dealt with. In the hymn X. 82, waters are spoken of as being the first substance or prime cause. Read verses 5-7. In hymn X. 125, वाक् is represented as the companion and upholder of the gods and as the foundation of all religious activity and its attendant boons. Hymn X. 129 is a typical hymn in this connection. It is called the creation-hymn. Prof. Deussen says of this hymn-" In its noble simplicity, in the loftiness of its philosophic vision, it is possibly the most admirable bit of philosophy of olden times......... No translation can ever do justice to the beauty of the original." "The avowed purpose of all philosophy is to account for the presence of the world and its contents as something which is not self-evident, and needs to be explained beyond the point of mere individual experience, or analysis through empirical knowledge. The creation hymn performs this act not without some unsteadiness and with petulance due to scepticism. In putting forth a fundamental principle without personality it does not fall far behind the best thought of later times inside or outside of India."

One thing, however, must be noted and it is that pessimism and the metempsychosis, the two main threads which are woven in everything Indian, and which are the distinguishing traits thereof, are wanting in the early philosophy of the Vedas.

LECTURE X.

SOCIAL LIFE TO BE GATHERED FROM THE RIGVEDA.

Allusions to the names of rivers in the 7th Maṇḍala—The country inhabited by the early Aryan colonists—villages and cities—forts—principal means of sustenance—different occupations and trades—gambling—family—marriage, the most sacred and important function—burning of widows—widow-remarriage—state—formation of tribes—images of gods—the caste-system.

It has been now indisputably proved by comparative philology that the Indians, Iranians, Greeks, Slavs, Germans and Italians had common ancestors, dwelling in a common country, whether it be central Asia or Norway, speaking a common language, in far distant ages. So also we know from a comparison of the Avesta and Vedic Sanskrit, that after the separation of the eastern branch from the western branch, the former i. e. Iranians and Indians lived together for a long time, calling themselves Aryans, to distinguish them from other tribes. After their separation from the Iranians, the eastern Aryans or Indians passed into India through the Western passes of the Hindukush. The part of India which these Indian Aryans occupied, during the composition of the Ṛigveda is sufficiently indicated by topical references in the Ṛigveda, especially the names of rivers. Accordingly the Aryans must have first settled themselves along the banks of the

Sindhu in the Punjab, where most of the hymns of the Ṛigveda Saṁhitâ must have been composed, before they passed to the regions of the Ganges where later Brahmanism dominated and which saw the composition of the Brâhmaṇas and Upanishads. In the 7th Maṇḍala the following passages may be noticed as mentioning the rivers. Thus we have, 18. 19; 18. 8; 18. 9; 18. 24; 95 and 96 in honour of the Saraswatí.

The Sindhu, the modern Indus, sometimes designated Samudra, is the much-praised Sarasvatí (lit-rich in water) in the Ṛigveda, by whose greatness, the singers were inspired into most glorious strains. The other rivers mentioned are Vitastâ (lit. stretched out) now Jhelum, Asikní (black) now Chinab, Parushṇí, Irávatí now Rawi, Vipáś (fetterless) now Bias, Śutudrí (changed later on to Śatadru = hundred course) now Sutlaj, and the Yamuná. The Ganges which in later times became the backbone of India is not mentioned in the Ṛigveda except X. 75. 5. So also, the Kubhá (Kábul) and Suvástu (the Swat) are referred to. Thus East Kabulistan and the Punjab may be regarded as the country where the early Aryan colonists lived.

Villages and cities are referred to, e.g. I. 114. 1, I. 44. 10. Iron cities or fortifications are mentioned in VII. 3. 7; VII. 15, 14; VII. 95. 1. Although these are alluded to as figurative expressions of the means of protection afforded by the gods, they, no doubt, suggest the idea of forts, consisting apparently of a series of concentric walls, as actually existing in the country at the time.

Cattle-keeping and agriculture are the principal means of sustenance. We frequently meet with prayers for herds of cattle, cows and horses, sheep and goats, especially the milch-cows which is 'the sum of all good which Indra has created for our enjoyment.' As for food, frequent mention is made of यव (I. 23. 15, I. 117. 21 etc.). Rice is not referred to in the Ṛigveda but is named in the Atharva-veda. (cf. VI. 140. 2 व्रीहिमत्तं यवमत्तमथो माषमथो तिलम्). Parched corn or धानाः are several times mentioned (III. 35. 3 and 7, III. 52.5); cakes and meal mixed with curds or butter (करम्भ) are offerd to the gods, (III. 52. 7; VI. 57. 2). Plants are frequently alluded to and are even invoked, (VII. 34. 23; VII. 35. 5, especially X. 97. 15). The cutting up of flesh, apparently for sacrificial purposes is mentioned in I. 161. 10. In V. 29. 7, VIII. 12. 8, VIII. 66 10, mention is made of the gods cooking or eating large numbers of buffaloes. From this it may be inferred that they also formed a portion of humn food. The drinking of Soma is referred to. The Soma juice was not only dear to Indra and other gods, but it was drunk by the worshippers themselves and its effects on them are occasionally described. Thus see VI. 47. 3; VIII. 48. 3. Wine (Surâ) was also in use. Thus see VII. 86. 6, VIII. 2.12. (In regard to the light in which wine-drinking was regarded in later times, the reader may consult Manu XI. 54, 90, 93-97, 148f, 249.)

Different occupations and trades are mentioned. In this connection, one should read especially Ṛig. IX. 112. 1-4. The construction of chariots is often referred to, and the skill shown in the composition of

hymns is described as a fabrication, and compared to the art of the carriage-builder. Thus cf. II. 19. 8, II. 35. 2 etc. Weaving was universally practised, as appears from the metaphorical use of the verb वे 'to weave' for the composition of hymns etc.; cf. VII. 33,9. and 12. The art of ship-building was known. cf. II. 39. 4; I. 25. 7; VII. 88. 8 f. Rope-making is referred to in VII. 84. 2; working in leather VII. 63. 1; VII. 89. 2.; VII. 103. 2. Agriculture is recommended to the gambler in X. 34. 13. Water courses, both artificial and natural are alluded to in III. 45. 3; VII. 49-2, from which we may reasonably infer that irrigation of lands under cultivation may have been practised.

Gambling was extensively practised; cf. VII. 86. 6. The whole of the hymn X. 34. should be read in this connection. Thieves and robbers are referred to in VII. 55. 3; VII. 86. 5.

The foundation of the state was formed by the family, at the head of which stood the father as lord of the house. The marriage was regarded as the most sacred and important function. 'The Vedic singers* knew no more tender relation than that between the husband and his willing, loving wife, who is praised as "his home, the darling abode and bliss in his house."‡ The high position of the wife is above all shown by the fact that she participates in the sacrifice with her husband; with harmonious mind at the early dawn, both, in fitting words, send up, their prayers to the

---

* Kaegi, Rigveda, p. 15.

‡ Rig. III. 53. 4 and 6.

eternals.* The so-called wedding hymn X. 85 may be read in this connection. In the new home, the young wife is subject to her husband, but at the same time mistress of the farm-labourers and slaves, and of parents and brothers-in-law.

All this is comprehensible only on the supposition that monogamy was the rule. And this is pointed to directly by the text. cf. I. 124. 7; IV. 3. 2, X. 71. 4; I 105. 2. However, there are some traces of the existence of poligamy, amongst Kshatriyas though it was, no doubt, the exception. cf. I. 62. 11; I. 71. 1; I. 105.8 (= X. 33. 2); VII. 26. 3; VII. 18. 2; X. 43. 1.

The woman seems to have been free to make her choice of a husband, as appears from X. 27. 11 and 12.

Marriage was looked upon as an arrangement founded by the gods, the aim of which was the mutual support of man and wife and the propagation of their race; therefore, it is the often-repeated wish of the Vedic singer to beget a son of his own flesh, whose place could never be filled by adoption. See VII. 4. 7 and 8 which allude to the inferiority of the adopted son to the natural-born one.

As for the burning of widows the practice does not seem to be evidenced directly by the Ṛigveda; yet, from other indications we have to accept the probability that the custom was also observed now and then in the Vedic period. Atharva Veda 18, 3, 1 proves the death of the wife with her departed husband as an old custom पुराण धर्म. But that the custom was not compulsory nor very general follows from such passages as X. 18. 7 and

* Ṛig. I. 122. 2; X. 86. 10.

X. 40. 2. The former passage is regarded as a distinct sanction for widow-burning by reading अग्ने: in place of अग्रे. That the usage only received decided sanction in late times is evident from the fact that "the Indian Law literature, from the oldest times upto the late period treats fully of the widow's right of inheritance and that the isolated references to the burning of widows in some of the lawbooks endorse it only as a matter of choice."*

As for the question of widow re-marriage, its general non-prevalence is naturally expected from the extremely important and sacred character of marriage. However, there is a passage which distinctly bears testimony to the fact that a widow was allowed to marry her husband's brother. In X. 40. 2 we have,

कुह स्विद्दोषा कुह वस्तोरश्विना कुहाभिपित्वं करतः कुहोषतुः ।
को वां शयुत्रा विधवेव देवरम् मर्यं न योषा कृणुते सधस्थ आ ॥

In elucidation of the comparison in l. 3, Prof. Roth in Nir. III. 15 refers to Manu IX. 69, 70, where it is enjoined that in certain circumstances a widow shall be married to her deceased husband's brother. In verse 60 of the same adhyáya of Manu, it is ruled that the union shall only subsist until one son has been procreated.

Allusions to conjugal infidelity and sexual immorality are rarely met with. cf. X. 34. 4 ; X. 40. 6; II. 29. 1

Women are sometimes spoken of as ungovernable and fickle. cf. VIII. 33. 17

Untruth is condemned in IV. 5. 5 and the gods are said to punish lying (I. 152. 1; VII. 49. 3 ; VII. 84.4.).

---

*Kaegi, Rigveda, p. 113 notes.

On the foundation of the family rests the state. For protection against threatened attacks and for the purpose of marauding incursions into the territory of other peoples, coalitions were formed between tribes; but in times of peace the tribe itself formed the highest political unit. The government was monarchical as is to be naturally expected from its origin in the family. The king stood at the head. Several kings or leaders are mentioned in the hymns of the Ṛigveda. Thus ten kings are alluded to as having fought against Sudas (cf. VII. 33.3. VII. 83. 6 ff). In VII. 18. 2, Indra is represented as living in lights, as a king among his wives which appears to indicate the existence of royal polygamy. It appears that it was regarded as eminently beneficial for a king to entertain a family-priest and we find that the liberality of different princes to the Ṛishis or priests by whom they were attended, is celebrated in numerous passages. The hymn X. 173 in which blessings are invoked on a king, may be read in this connection.

As for the religion and worship of the Vedic people, I have said a good deal in a separate lecture. An interesting question may be touched upon, here, and it is this 'did the Vedic Indians make images of their gods'? Max Müller (Chips from a German Workshop I. 38) says "The religion of the Veda knows of no idols. The worship of idols in India is a secondary formation, a later degradation of the more primitive worship of ideal gods". On the other hand, the opposite view is put forth by Dr. F. Bollensen, according to whom, the use of such appellations as 'दिवो नरः' 'नृपेशसः' in connection

with gods, proves not only that human forms were assigned to gods in imagination, but the gods were also actually represented in a sensible manner. He adduces in his support, II. 33-9, I. 25-13, V. 52-15, in which last passage the Maruts seem to be distinguished from their gods i. e. from their images. The question however, can not be decided either way, for the present.

Do the Vedas contain the caste-system? Nothing dominates the life of a Hindu more than religious institutions; and no institution is more tyrannical in its influence than the caste-system. Its grotesque inconsistencies and bitter tyranny have gone far to make the Hindu what he is. Bloomfield condemns it downright and remarks*, "The corrosive properties of this single institution, more than anything else whatsoever have checked the development of India into a nation. They have made possible the spectacle of a country of nearly 300 millions of inhabitants, governed by the skill of 60,000 military and 60,000 civilian foreigners."

This is not the place to refute or justify these remarks. We are concerned with the question whether there is anything like the present caste-system evidenced by the hymns of the Ṛig-Veda.

It must be first stated that nothing like the present divisions and sub-divisions which have made the caste system a caste-chaos, has place anywhere in ancient Sanskrit Literature. There is a Hindustani proverb 'eight brahmans, nine kitchens.' It is only the fourfold division into Brâhmaṇa, Kshatriya, Vaiśya and Śúdra that is very frequently referred to. For the

* Religion, Bloomfield, p. 5.

several passages in Bráhmaṇas, Puráṇas and other works referring to caste and its origination, I may refer you to Muir's O. S. Texts Vol. I.

In the hymns of Ṛig-Veda, however, there is only one passage referring to this four-fold division and that is X. 90-12. This hymn, generally known as the Purusha-Súkta is, however, regarded by many scholars as being very late in character and belonging to the last outskirts of the Saṁhitá-period, on account of several indications of its modern character, such as the use of terms like Bráhmaṇa and Vaiśya which rarely or never again occur in the Ṛig-Veda, the pantheistic ideas, which do not find a place in the older portions of the Ṛig-Veda, the smoothness and regularity of metre and others. Thus it is argued that even the conception of the four castes is foreign to the Ṛig-Veda proper; and even this allusion is more an allegorical representation than a literal statement of facts.

Others, however, (Dr. Haug, for instance,) hold that the hymn may not be necessarily regarded as modern in character, because such cosmological and speculative conceptions are met with in about every part of the Ṛig-Veda Saṁhitá and that the allegory is most significant and instructive.

Thus Dr. Haug remarks*—"Now according to this passage, which is the most ancient and authoritative we have on the origin of Brahmanism and caste in general, the Bráhman has not come from the mouth of this primary being, the Purusha, but the mouth of the latter became the Brahmanical caste, that is to say,

* Muir, Original Sanskrit Texts, Vol. I. p. 14.

was transformed into it. The passage has, no doubt, an allegorical sense. Mouth is the seat of speech. The allegory thus points out that the Brahmans are teachers and instructors of mankind. The arms are the seat of strength. If the two arms of the Purusha are said to have been made a Kshatriya (warrior), that means, then, that the Kshatriya have to carry arms to defend the empire. That the thighs of the Purusha were transfomed into the Vaiśya means that, as the lower parts of the body are the principal repository of food taken, the Vaiśya caste is destined to provide food for the others. The creation of the Śúdra fròm the feet of the Purusha indicates that he is destined to be a servant to the others, just as the foot serves the other parts of the body as a firm support." It is this verse 12 of the Purusha Súkta which is generally put forth as an evidence for the determination of caste by birth. By the side of this, however, may be cited the passage from the Bhagavadgítá--"चातुर्वर्ण्यं मया सृष्टं गुण-कर्मविभागशः" which afirms that the fourfold division of caste depends upon qualities and actions (as opposed to birth). Even this passage is, however, interpreted by the orthodox people in their favour, by laying stress on the word 'सृष्टम्'.

LECTURE XI.

GRAMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE VEDA.

Vedic inflexional forms, comparatively more varied and regular.—Peculiarities of Sandhi—Peculiarities of Declension—Peculiarities of conjugation—Infinitives and Gerunds—The subjunctive—Peculiarities of syntax.

A general comparison of the Sanskrit of the Ṛigveda with the Classical Sanskrit will show that the former is more rich and regular in inflexional forms than the latter which has become more rigid and less multiform. Thus, for instance, in the case of declension of nouns, where we had originally two or three forms for a particular case-ending, we have now only one; and in the case of the conjugation of verbs, whole tenses or moods have become obsolete. Thus, there is nothing in the Classical Sanskrit corresponding to the Subjunctive in the Veda, and the Vedic infinitive has about eight forms, while the classical infinitive has only one. In the same way a greater variety can be marked in the Vedic Sandhi as compared with the Classical Sanskrit. In order to see the truth of all this, it is necessary to be acquainted with the grammatical forms which the Vedic Sanskrit has in contradistinction from the Classical Sanskrit, which we today proceed to note, with illustrations from the 7th Maṇḍala, as far as possible.

To begin with, in the matter of Sandhis in Classical Sanskṛit, hiatus is generally forbidden; but in the Vedic Sanskṛit, it is very abundantly admitted. Thus in innumerable instances य and व are to be read as इ and उ, and less often a long vowel is to be resolved into two vowels, in order to make good the metre. As illustrations, the student may refer to Ṛigveda VII. 14-1[d], 66-11[b], 4-1[b], 4-8[c], 6-3[d], 14-2[c], 21-4[a], 22-4[b], and so on.

The disappearance of an initial अ after a final ए or ओ which is the invariable rule in Classical Sanskṛit, is, in the Veda, only an occasional occurrence; and in this respect, there is no accordance between the written and spoken form of the Vedic text. The अ is many times elided where the metre requires it, while it is retained, where the metre requires its omission. Here are some instances, VII. 1-7[a], 1-8[a], 1-9[a], 1-11[a], 1-19[b], 66-5[c], 61-3[d], 18-7[c], 33-11[b], 57-5[c], 71-5[a].

The final ई, ऊ, ए of a dual form are maintained uncombined with the following vowel, but the Ṛigveda shows many exceptions to this, especially before इव e.g. VII. 87-2[c], 72-3[c], 104-6[d]. The combination with इव following, without regard to the form of the ending (e. g. अः आः etc. or अम्, इम, उम etc.) is so frequent that the simplest explanation is the presence of the parallel form व regularly used in Páli and in the verses of Buddhist Sanskṛit.

The change of न to ण by the preceding of ऋ, र्, ष्, takes place in the Veda, occasionally even when the latter belong to a different word, essentially unconnect-

ed. Especially the pronominal forms नः and एन are thus affected very often.

Original final न् is retained after a nasal. Thus final आन्, ईन्, ऊन् and ऋन् become आँ, ईं, ऊँ and ऋं, the स् after these nasalised vowels being treated as if it were after pure vowels. Thus we have दस्यूँरोकस: (VII, 5-6), so also 6-3, 3 3, 10-5, 11-1.

In the Veda, the final vowel of a word–generally अ, much less often इ or उ–is in a large number of cases prolonged, usually when it is favoured by the metre, but sometimes even where the metre opposes the change.* Such words are (1) particles like अथ, अध etc. (2) case-forms like एना, तेना etc. (3) verb-forms like पिबा, स्था, शृणुता, विद्मा, शुक्ष्वा, वेदा, कृधी, कृणुही etc., and (4) gerunds in य.

Next we proceed to the Declension of nouns. Let us begin with the masculine and neuter nouns ending in अ. In their case, the singular of the Instrumental (both m. n.), shows a peculiar form, either ending in एना or आ. The following are instances from the 7th Mandala;--18. 17 चैत्येना ; 55. 7 तेना सहस्येना; 71. 4 एना; 93. 7 एना ; 32. 7 त्वा इषित (त्वा instr of त्व) ; 13. 2 महित्वा ; 20. 4 ; 23. 3; 58. 1 ; 61. 4 ; 97. 8 ; 100. 3.

The Dual of the Nominative and Accusative (m. only), usually ends in आ ; while औ is only exceptional. आ occurs generally, (1) at the end of a पाद, (2) before consonants, (3) before an initial vowel with which it is fused and is never used before vowels with hiatus. A good illustration where both forms occur side by side is I. 184, 1 'ता वाम् अद्य तावपरं हुवेम'.

* See Whitney, grammar, 248 article.

Instances of forms ending in आ are VII. 1. 17, 2. 7 [d], 18. 22[b], 70. 1, 50. 1, 67. 5. However, note 50. 2, 84. 2 where आँ occurs before consonants.

Next is to be noticed the Plural of the nominative and vocative (m.) There are two endings आस: and आ:. The forms in आस: are about one half as numerous as those in आ: in Ṛigveda. In the Atharvaveda, there are comparatively very few forms in आस:; thus the ending आस: is older and goes gradually out of use in the Vedic period; we have also many instances, where both forms stand often side by side; e.g. Rigveda, IV. 25. 8, VII. 97. 6. A pâda deficient by one syllable is often emended by substituting आस: for आ:; e.g. VII. 35. 14[d]. Other instances of आस: in the 7th Maṇḍala are 1. 9, 1.15, 1. 17, 4. 3, 15. 9, 16. 3, and many more.

For the Plural of the Nominative, Accusative, and Vocative (Neuter) there are two endings, आ and आनि. The older (आ) has far outnumbered the younger in Rigveda, though there are many instances where both stand side by side. In the Atharvaveda the proportion is much reduced, though the older form has held its own against the younger form, better than any other similar Vedic form. Instances in the 7th Maṇḍala are 1. 18[a], 3. 4[b], 3. 10[a], 4. 1, 4. 2, 5. 7, 18.1 and so on. The genesis of the younger form can be best explained by supposing that there is a transfer from the अ declension to the अन् declension which is also shown by the co-existence of such forms as कृत्रिमा, कृत्रिमाणि etc., cf. VII. 19. 4, VII. 67. 9. Sometimes a पाद deficient by one syllable can be emended by reading आनि for आ e. g. VII, 4. 2.

For the Plural of the Instrumental (m. & n.) there are two endings एभिः and ऐः both almost equally frequent in the Ṛig-Veda, the older however dying out gradually in the Vedic period. Both sometimes occur side by side. The only trace of the ending एभिः in later Sanskrit is एभिः (from इदम्). Instances in the 7th Maṇḍala are—2-8, 2-11, 7-2, 7-6.

Next, we come to nouns in आ. In the case of these (feminine), for the Singular of the Instrumental, there are two endings, आ and अया. The older ending is about as frequent as the younger. The older ending is generally applied to stems in ता or इआ (or या), (with इआ or या naturally the younger ending would sound very badly). Instances in the 7th Maṇḍala are, 1-11, 1-14, 18-7, 23-1, 32-14, etc. One instance of the peculiar Sing. Dative fem. is the form अवीरते in VII. 1-19 a.

For the Plural of the Nominative (f), आः is the very general ending, but in very few cases आसः (perhaps extended from the masculine) is also met with. Thus we have VII. 28-4 'दुर्मित्रासः क्षितयः', VII. 18-3 'पस्पृधानासः......गिरः'.

Next we come to stems in इ (f.). For the Instrumental Singular, the final is only lengthened in the Veda. Instances in the 7th Maṇḍala are, 1-1, 1-21, 20-2, 25-1, 32-15, 32-21. For the Locative Singular, the final इ is changd to आ, (1) generally before consonants, (2) before an initial vowel with which it is fused, (3) never used before vowels with hiatus; *e.g.* VII. 2-5, 18-19, 19-3, 27-1. Even masculine nouns in इ have sometimes a Loc. Sing. form ending in आ; *e. g.* अग्ना or sometimes extended to अग्नायि. The Genitive and Ablative Singu-

lar of masculine nouns in इ is sometimes made by only adding the termination without having Guṇa; *e. g.* अर्यः from अरि. The Nominative Plural of feminine nouns in इ is sometimes like भूमीः etc.

As for nouns in (उ mas. and neu.) we meet with such forms as Abl. Sing. वस्वः VII. 15-4, Dat. Sing. क्रत्वे VII. 25.4, Loc. sing. सानवि, Instr. Sing. क्रत्वा VII. 21-6, 4-5. Nouns in ई fem. have Nom. Plu. like देवीः—2-8, 10-3, 5-3, 26-4, Instru. Sing. शमी. Nouns in इ neut. have for their nom. plu. such forms as:—क्रुध्मी VII. 56-8; शुन्ची VII. 56-12; अप्रती VII 23-3. In the case of fem. nouns in उ, we have such forms as the Accu. Sing. तन्वम् VII. 8-5.

Nouns ending in ऋ mas. and fem. have their Nom. Dual ending in आ which occurs (1) at the end of a pâda, (2) before consonants, (3) before an initial vowel with which it is fused, (4) never before vowels with hiatus. *e. g.* मातरा—7-3. युष्मे and अस्मे are often found used for युष्मासु and अस्मासु.

In the case of nouns in अन्, we have a peculiar Loc. Sing. form without any termination. *e.g.* व्योमन् (=व्योमनि), परिज्मन् (=परिज्मनि) etc.

Next, I may proceed to conjugation. Here I must content myself only with noting a few peculiarities which are very frequently met with. For a fuller and exhaustive treatment of the Verb-inflection in the Ṛig-veda the student is referred to Avery's Verb-inflection in Sanskṛit (Journal of the American Oriental Society Vol. X.).

The first person plural termination (Parasmaipada) of the Present tense is मस् invariably in Classical San-

skṛit. But in the Ṛigveda, मसि is found more frequently by the side of मस्. मसि is found 117 times in the Ṛig-Veda, and 3 times only in the Aitareya Bràhmaṇa, but never in classical Sanskṛit. On the other hand, मस् appears only 21 times in the Rigveda, 4 times in the Aitareya Brâhmaṇa and is the only ending in Classical Sanskṛit. Thus it appears that the longer ending was far in advance in the time of Ṛigveda, that it was overtaken by the shorter ending in the Bráhmaṇa period, and driven entirely off the field in the Classical period. (Cf. चोयामसि VII. 21-1, सिनीमसि I. 25-1).

The 3rd pers. Sing. ending (Atmanepada) of the present tense is sometimes ए instead of ते; *e. g.* शृण्वे VII. 8-4, VII. 26-4.

The Imperative 2nd pers. sing. deserves notice. The classical rule requires धि after consonants excepting nasals, ल् and र् and in the 9th conjugation which substitutes आन; हि after vowels (excepting अ and उ of the 5th and 8th conjugations, after a single consonant) nasals, ल् and र्; after अ and उ following a single consonant, the ending is dropped. This rule is not observed in the Veda, but the ending धि is more frequently found. Examples from the 7th Maṇḍala are,—शशाधि (1-20), कृधि (16-6, 25-5), श्रुधि (22-4, 32-1). The root श्रु shows the three successive stages श्रुधि, शृणुहि and शृणु. Notice also forms like गहि (from गम्.)

The longer endings थन and तन instead of थ and त in the 2nd pers. pl. are also met with in the Veda.

We also meet with in the Ṛigveda some peculiar forms of the 2nd pers. sing. having an imperative value, made by adding the ending सि to the root. Examples from the 7th Maṇḍala are--श्रोषि (18-2), भक्षि (41-2), यक्षि and वोषि (16-5).

Certain perfect participles whose stem is monosyllabic owing to the absence of the reduplication are met with ; *e. g.* दाश्वान्, मीढ्वान्, साह्वान्.

The infinitive presents a great variety of forms. A number of verbal nouns in various of their cases are used in such a way as to be assimilated to the infinitive. Thus, in addition to the Classical infinitive in तुम्, which is, really speaking, nothing more than the Accusative Singular form of the root-noun formed by तु, we have the dative form from the same, used as an infinitive ; *e. g.* आवितवे (VII. 33-1), अन्वेतवे (VII. 33-8).

Infinitives are also found with the ending तवै (*e. g.* हन्तवै, एतवै), with the ending असे *i. e.* the dative singular of the root-noun ending in अस् (*e. g.* चक्षसे, जीवसे), with the ending तये *i. e.* the Dative Sing. of the root-noun ending in ति (*e. g.* पीतये, ऊतये), with the ending ध्यै (*e. g.* स्तवध्यै VII. 37-1, इषध्यै VII. 43-1, पृणध्यै, शुन्धध्यै), with the ending तोः *i. e.* the Geni. Sing. of the root-noun ending in तु (*e. g.* एतोः, कर्तोः,) and with some more endings.

In addition to gerunds ending in त्वा, we have those ending in त्वाय and त्वी (which is very common) ; *e. g.* हत्वाय, कृत्वी, पीत्वी, भूत्वी.)

The subjunctive mood, whose remnant is seen in Classical Sanskṛit only in the Imperfect and Aorist forms without augment, after the particle मा prohibitive, is a very frequent formation in the Ṛigveda,

denominated as लेट् by Sanskṛit grammarians. Such forms as भवाति (VII. 8-6), पताति (VII. 25-1), तारिषत, जोषिषत, मादयैते, गृह्णान्तै are illustrations of the subjunctive.

Next I may notice some peculiarities of sentence-structure. The first and the foremost feature is the position of prepositions or *upasargas* in a sentence. In later Sanskṛit, the *upasarga*, as a rule, must immediately precede the verb of which it forms a part, and no word is allowed to intervene between them. But in the Ṛigveda the *upasarga* is separated from the verb by one or more words. As instances may be given the following verses from the 7th Maṇḍala– 1-4, 1-6, 1-7, 1-8, 3-9, 4-1, 8-4, 8-6, 21-7, 24-4, 24-6, 60-3, 60-4, 86-1, 86-5 and many more.

Another peculiarity is that the preposition, once used with the verb, is alone repeated without the verb which is implied, and the preposition alone stands for the whole verb. Instances from Maṇḍala 7, are 1-6, 86-5. Sometimes the *upasargas* alone are used and the verb has to be implied, to complete the sentence, as in VII. 6-1 and 3. Sometimes we meet with paranthetical sentences having no syntactical connection with what precedes or what follows, as in VII. 1-15. Sometimes a relative sentence is used, without a corresponding correlative sentence or without a word to connect it with the correlative sentence, *e. g.* VII. 1-8 and 12.

LECTURE XII.

VEDIC METRE.

Reasons for the preference for metre—The meaning of the word *Chhandas*—The most prominent of Vedic metres stated —A synopsis of the metres of the 7th Maṇḍala--Two schools of critics—those who maintain the text and admit metrical irregularity—those who advocate textual restoration—Textual restorations generally agreed upon—The number of syllables in foot, not the only rule—also rules of rhythm—Historical development—Four periods based upon metrical criteria.

If one casts a glance at the Sanskṛit literature in general, he will find that a very large majority of it is metrical. The epics, Puráṇas, law-books, Kávyas are all metrical compositions. And to this the oldest Sanskṛit book, I mean, the Saṁhitá of the Ṛigveda, is no exception. And this preference for metre of the old Vedic Ṛishis is but natural. For, in the first place, the language of nature clothes itself in metre. Deep, strong passions express themselves in metre; for a metre is nothing but a particular arrangement of high and low tunes. Secondly, as the Vedic hymns were composed for sacrificial purposes, with a view to propitiate the gods, nothing could please them better than prayers sung. Mere recitations of prose formulæ or lectures do not possess that attraction which naturally belongs to songs sung or hymns chanted. Thirdly, the metrical limitations served a most practical purpose, that of preserving and remembering easily what was compos-

ed, especially when writing was not in vogue. It is the experience of every one that a verse can be more easily and more permanently committed in memory than a mere prose statement. Hence, the necessity of putting rules of grammar and whole lexicons in a metrical form. Students of Sanskrit need not be reminded of the Káriká́s of grammar and Amarakosá. And the credit of preserving without corruption the Vedic texts may be largely due to the fact that they are in a fixed metrical form. Hence, the statement in Śikshá explaining the relation of Chhandas to Veda— 'छन्दः पादौ तु वेदस्य'—the metre is the feet of the Veda. Just as a man is supported and enabled to move freely at his will, by his feet, in the same way, the Vedas are supported and enabled to hold their own everywhere and at all times by metres.

The word छन्दस् is derived from चदि आह्लादने, from which the name चन्द्र is also derived; and who will deny that a composition clothed in a metrical form affords comparatively greater pleasure? Yáska derives the word from छद् to cover and छन्दस् is so called, because it is the covering of the Vedic texts. By metaphor the texts of the Veda themselves came to be called छन्दस् because their external form was metrical.* Thus छन्दस् became a synonym of वेद,* and as the grammar and metre of the Veda is more irregular or rather much less regular, from the point of view of Classical Sanskrit, छान्दस came to mean 'irregular' or 'whimsical', and

---

'यदेभिरात्मानमाच्छादयन्देवा मृत्योर्बिभ्यतः तच्छन्दसां छन्दस्त्वम्', quoted from a Bráhmaṇa by Durga on Nir. VII. 12.

the word has come down to be so used even in our vernacular.

छन्दस् as I have already said in Lecture 2, is included in the six Vedángas and the oldest work at present available is the treatise of Pingala, which deals with not only the Vedic metres but with the classical metres also.

Broadly speaking, the Vedic metres are much less regular than the classical metres, in fact, there being no hard and fast rules regarding the quantity and order of the several letters, the total number of syllables being the only criterion of distinguishing one metre from another.

From the metrical point of view, the Ṛigveda Saṁhitá is made up of hymns or सूक्तs, each of which consists of a certain number of verses or ऋच्s, and each verse consists of two or more feet, and each foot consists of a certain number of syllables.

The most prominent of the Vedic metres are—

गायत्री	8,	8,	8.*		
उष्णिक्	8,	8,	12.		
पुरउष्णिक्	12,	8,	8.		
ककुभ्	8,	12,	8.		
अनुष्टुभ्	8,	8,	8,	8.	
बृहती	8,	8,	12,	8.	
सतोबृहती	12,	8,	12,	8.	
पङ्क्ति	8,	8,	8,	8,	8.

* The names of the metres are followed by the numbers of the syllables in each of the several feet of which they are made up.

प्रस्तारपङ्क्ति	12,	12,	8,	8.	
विराज्	10,	10, or 11,	11,	11,	11.
त्रिष्टुभ्	11,	11,	11,	11.	
जगती	12,	12,	12,	12.	

There are, of course, many sub-varieties of these metres, formed by diversifying the order of the several feet. The metres of the different verses in the hymns of the Ṛig-Veda are all exhaustively given in the Sarvánukramaṇi of Kátyáyana, extracts from which are, as a rule quoted by Sáyaṇa at the commencement of his commentary on each hymn. Thus restricting ourselves to the 7th Maṇḍala, we find that the त्रिष्टुभ् metre prevails mostly throughout the book with a very few exceptions of other metres. Thus, hymns 15, 31 (1–9), 55 (1), 59 (9, 10, 11), 66 (1–9 & 17–19), 89 (1–4), 94 (1–11), 96 (4–6), 102 are गायत्री.

Hymns 1 (1-18), 22 (1-8), 31 (10-12), 68(1-7), are विराज् त्र्येकादशका ; while 32 (3) is द्विपदा विराज् (12, 8), and 34 (1-21), 56 (1-11), are द्विपदा विराज् (10,10).

Hymn 14 (1) is बृहती; while 55 (2-4) is उपरिष्टाद् बृहती (8, 8, 8, 12). Hymns 16, 32 (excepting verse 3), 59 (1-6), 66 (10-15), 74 (1-6), 81 (1-6), 96 (1-2), have बृहती and सतोबृहती in alternate verses. Such pairs of बृहती and सतोबृहती seem to be denominated as प्रगाथ in the Sarvánukramaṇi.

Hymns 41(1), 44 (1), 46 (1-3), 50 (1-3), 82, 83, 89 (5), 104 (1-6. 18, 21, 23) are जगती.

Hymns 55 (5-8), 59 (12), 94 (12), 103 (1), 104 (25) are अनुष्टुभ्. One hymn only i. e. 17 is द्विपदा त्रिष्टुभ्.

One verse i.e. 50 (4), is अतिजगती, also called शक्वरी (consisting of five feet having 10, 10, 11, 11, 11, sylla-

bles respectively). One verse 66 (16), is पुरउष्णिक् (12, 8, 8). One verse 96 (3) is प्रस्तारपङ्क्ति (12, 12, 8, 8). And one verse 104 (7) is either जगती or त्रिष्टुप्.

All other verses not mentioned in the above are त्रिष्टुप् which may be thus said to be the prevailing metre of the 7th Maṇḍala.

It was said above that the only rule is regarding the number of syllables in a foot of the metre without any regard to the quantity or order of the several syllables. But even this number of syllables seems to fail us now and then. Thus, for instance, where a foot ought to have 12 syllables in conformity with other feet of the same verse, it has 11, or where it ought to have 11, it has 10 and so on. Thus for instance, in VII. 1. 3, the first line has only 10 syllables where as it ought to have 11 syllables to be a foot of the विराज् metre (consisting of three feet, each of 11 syllables). Similar is the case of the 2nd line in the same verse. Now the question arises,—is it an irregularity of metre of which the Vedic poets were not very careful and did not observe strict regularity? or is there some mistake in writing the text, the recitation being quite conformable to the requirements of the metre?

According to the answer given to these questions, there are two schools of Vedic critics. Some, having regard to the great antiquity and authority of the Saṁhitâ text, feel alarmed at any proposal to tamper with it, and are inclined in all cases of doubt to maintain the text and to admit a *metrical irregularity*. Others again recognizing the general skilfulness of the Vedic bards, propose in the same cases *textual restoration*. No one

of these views must be carried to an extreme or followed to the exclusion of the other. We can neither regard the text as final nor the metrical standards as holding good without exception. The principle underlying the admission of either this or that view in the present case, is clearly *quantitative*. The multiplicity of instances constitutes the proof. All commentators adopt without hesitation that hypothesis which accounts for the largest number of facts in the simplest way. If one textual correction will rectify ten verses, we make the textual correction ; if the admission of one metrical variation or irregularity will accord with the text of ten verses, we admit the metrical variation. Thus to decide which of these courses is to be followed in a particular case, requires a detailed examination of the text.

Thus the following textual restorations have been generally agreed upon.

(1) Where the text, in accordance with the classical rules of sandhi combines the final vowel of one word with the initial vowel of the next, final अ, आ must occasionally, and final इ, ई, उ, ऊ, generally be read as separate syllables. Thus to take instances from the 7th Maṇḍala, 1. 3^{a} महद्व:, 1. 3^{b} सुऊर्मिआ, 3. 1^{d} घृतअन्न, 8. 1^{d} आ अग्नि ;, 4. 6^{a}, 4. 7^{a}, 5. 2^{a}, and so on.

(2) Where the text omits initial अ after final अ: or ए, the initial अ must usually he restored as a separate syllable. Thus, in the 7th Maṇḍala, 1. 4^{a} अग्नयो अग्निभ्यो, 1. 19^{a} अग्ने अवीरते, 2. 10^{a} वनस्पते अव and so on.

(3) In numerous words and endings, the value of a separate syllable is either necessarily or optionally to

be given to य्, व्, of the text. Thus, in the 7th Mandala—1. 11[c] दुरिआसु दुर्य, 18. 12[c] सखिआय सख्यम्—Notice that in these two instances, the syllabic and consonantal values are found side by side: so also—15. 15[c], 5. 5[c], 6. 1[b], 5. 9[b], 19. 2[a] (तुअम्), 32. 26[b], 104. 4[c], 104. 20[c], 104. 20[d], 104. 25[d] and so on.

(4) In a few words, long vowels or dipthongs are optionally to be read as equivalent to two syllables. Thus, in the 7th Mandala, 65. 1[c], 86.4[a], 97. 3[a], we restore ज्येष्ठ to ज्ययिष्ठ; 93. 1[d] धेष्ठ to धयिष्ठ; 34. 14[b], 36. 5[d], 88. 1[a] प्रेष्ठ to प्रयिष्ठ; 40. 6[d] वात to वअत.

(5) A few words are regularly misrepresented; thus, for पावक, we must always read पवाक, for सुवानः almost always स्वानः, for मृळय always मृळय. Thus in the 7th Mandala, we have, 49. 2 and 3, 56. 12, and 57. 5, in which पावकाः occuring at the end of the foot has to be read पवाकाः to suit the closing rhythm. So in 89. 1 and all verses, मृळय has to be read मृळय for the same purpose.

There are other restorations also, though less certain in character. Thus,

(6) the word इन्द्र has to be read as a word of three syllables, though in a very large number of cases it is a word of two syllables. Thus VII. 19.2[a] 'तुअं ह त्यदिंदर' etc., VII. 19. 6[a], 20. 2[a], 21. 5[a], 21-6[a], 22. 1[a], and so on.

(7) The restoration of अअम् for आम् in the genitive plural of all declensions is required, generally at the end of an eight-syllabled foot. Thus—VII. 16. 2[d], 16. 7[d], 32, 11[d], 32. 25[d], 66. 3[b], 74. 6[b] and so on. Verse I. 167. 10 illustrates in one, most of these restorations.

So far we have spoken of the external form of the metre or merely the number of syllables in a foot. Indian commentators generally stop here and hold that the internal form or the rhythm is even more irregular and free than the external, so as to be of no importance at all, comparatively speaking. Thus they say that there are no rules of rhythm at all in the Ṛigveda, the number of syllables in a foot being the only rule. Modern critics, however, have, from a detailed examination of the text from the metrical point of view, come to the conclusion that there is no considerable part of the verse in which certain rhythms are not steadily favoured, and others avoided; that everywhere there exist metrical preferences. Thus, for instance, we find that at the end of a foot of 11 or 12 syllables, the last 4 syllables are very generally ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑, while at the end of a foot of 8 syllables they are generally – ⏑ – ⏑. A detailed study of this inner construction or rhythm of the foot has shown that there is a regular gradual historical development seen through the different parts of the Ṛigveda, and has enabled Vedic critics to lay down certain metrical criteria which distinguish one period of Ṛigveda from another. Thus, Prof. Arnold in his Vedic Metre, has arrived at four periods, (1) *the bardic period* or the period of originality and rivalry between the bardic families, to which belong hymns of Maṇḍala VII, VI, and many more, and where a greater variety of inner and external construction is observed; (2) *The normal period*, in which perfection rather than originality of form is the aim, to which belong hymns of Maṇḍala III, IV, and IX, where two

metres are almost exclusively employed, namely, Trishṭubh and Gáyatrí, where there is little variety but an attempt at uniformity and regularity; (3) *the cretic-period* where almost exclusively Trishṭubh and Jagatí metres are employed and the cretic rhythm is favoured, to which belong many of the hymns of the 1st Maṇḍala and a few of the 10th, a period of transition; and (4) *the popular period* the hymns of which resemble in form and character, the Atharva veda, to which belong a large number of the hymns of the 10th Maṇḍala, and of which, the contamination of a त्रिष्टुभ् hymn by जगती stanzas is the characteristic.

Thus, the irregularity in rhythm and the quantity of the different syllables making a foot which an ordinary reader passes by, unnoticed, is only apparent and is the result of the inventive spirit sometime leading to the construction of new and harmonious forms. For, it is difficult to think that a professional bard should without motive have left his verse with an irregular rhythm, when any European scholar without serious practice of the art of versification, can put it into order for him with hardly a perceptible alteration in the meaning. Prof. Arnold thus very highly thinks of the skill and art of the Vedic bards "...As works of mechanical* art the metres of the Ṛigveda stand high above those of modern Europe in variety of motive and in flexibility of form. They seem, indeed, to bear the same relation to them as the rich harmonies of classical music to the simple melodies of the peasant. And in proportion as modern students come to appreciate the

* Arnold, Vedic Metre: p. 21.

skill displayed by the Vedic poets, they will be glad to abandon the easy but untenable theory that the variety of form employed by them is due to chance, or the purely personal bias of individuals, and to recognize instead that we find all the signs of a genuine historical development.... ....".

LECTURE XIII

THE AGE OF RIGVEDA.

Linguistic or literary theories—Max Müller's view that the date of Rigveda falls about 1200 B. C.—Objections to the same—views of Whitney and others – Astronomical theories—Haug's view—Dikshit's view—Tilak's view—Jacobi's theory.

No one now doubts that the Ṛigveda is the most ancient document of the Aryans, and that although it represents a stage of no mean civilisation, whether in respect of the development of language, or religion, or philosophy, still to us the Ṛigveda represents the most ancient chapter in the history of the human intellect, what preceded that period whether in India or in any other part of the Aryan world, being lost to us beyond the hope of recovery. Notwithstanding the universal agreement in this respect, there is still a diversity of views regarding the probable age of the Ṛigveda. Several theories have been advanced with more or less cogent arguments, but nothing conclusive may be said to have been established. On the question of the age of the Ṛigveda, the final word has yet to be said. I propose to-day to acquaint you briefly with some of the views held on the subject.

The materials for the re-construction of Indian chronology are supplied principally from (1) the Literatures of the Brâhmaṇas, the Jainas and the Buddhists, (2) inscriptions on stone or copper plate, coins and seals and (3) the accounts of foreign writers, chiefly Greek,

Latin and Chinese. The question regarding the age of Ṛigveda can not derive any benefit from the last two sources, on account of its extreme antiquity. Thus the only source that remains is the literary evidence on which are based the so-called literary or linguistic theories.

The most popular of such theories is the one first promulgated by the great Vedic Scholar Max Müller, who approximately assigned the Ṛigveda to 1200 B. C. This date has been accepted very generally and even the very recently published book, 'Ancient India', by Prof. Rapson accepts it. The arguments adduced by Max Müller in favour of his view may be briefly stated as follows :—

To begin with, Max Müller divides the Vedic Literature into four periods, as noticed above in my Lecture 2,—the Chhandas period, the Mantra period, the Bráhmaṇa period, and the Sútra period, on the ground of the nature of language and thought, and the successive stages marked therein, every following period presupposing the existence of the preceding one. To the last or Sútra period, belong two classes of works named Anukramaṇis and Pariśishṭas. Of the authors of Anukramaṇis there stand out two, more prominently than the rest, viz. Śaunaka, who wrote Anukramaṇís to the Ṛigveda and Kátyáyana who wrote two Sarvánukramaṇís, one to the Ṛigveda, and the other to the white Yajurveda. Now if we compare these works, we find that Śaunaka writes in mixed Ślokas and takes great liberties with the metre ; while Kátyáyana writes in prose and introduces the artificial contrivances

of the later Sútras, a difference which is quite in keeping with the general course of Sanskrit literature in India. Again, Śaunaka's index follows the original division of the Ṛigveda into Maṇḍalas, Anuvákas and Súktas; while Kátyáyana has adopted the more practical and more modern division into Ashṭakas, adhyáyas and Vargas. Both agree in following the united Śákhá of the Śákalas and Bâshkalas and in excluding the khilas or supplementary hymns, but the latter has admitted the eleven Vâlakhilya hymns, thus bringing the total number of hymns to 1028 from 1017.

From all these indications, we are naturally led to expect that both Śaunaka and Kátyáyana belonged to the same Śákhá and that Śaunaka was anterior to Kátyáyana.

From what Shaḍguruśishya remarks* in his commentary on the Sarvánukramaṇí of Kátyáyana, while explaining the genealogy of the latter we can gather that there are four generations of teachers and pupils referred to, first, Śaunaka, second, Aśvaláyana, third, Kátyáyana, and fourth, Patañjali. This Kátyáyana also identified with Vararuchi is spoken of by Somadevabhaṭṭa in his Kathásaritságara, as having become a minister of king Nanda at Pátaliputra. If we can believe in this tradition, here we get a clue to ascertain the date of Kátyáyana.

In the Ancient Sanskrit Chronology the two dates have been fixed beyond all doubt—the date of Buddha's death which is 483 B. C. and of the coronation of Aśoka, which is 264 B. C. which are regarded as the

* See Ancient Sanskrit Literature. p. 233.

sheet-anchors of Indian chronology. Chandragupta, the founder of the Maurya empire, who was succeeded by Bindusára, whose successor was the great Asoka, comes between 321 and 297 B. C. It was this Chandragupta who put down the Nandas with whom Kátyáyana is connected as minister. Thus कात्यायन falls about 325 B. C.

पतञ्जलि the writer of the Vyákaraṇa-Mahábháshya has been now generally assigned to the second century B. C. which also, allowing sufficient period to elapse between himself and Kátyáyana, the writer of the Vártikas, points to the 4th century B. C. as the age of the latter.

Asvaláyana then would fall about 350 B. C. and शौनक about 400 B. C. But as शौनक's work cannot belong to the earliest productions of the Sútra-period, and as some more works after Kátyáyana must have been written during the Sútra period, the Sútra period may be supposed to have extended, broadly speaking, from 600 to 200 B. C.

The same conclusion is confirmed by a consideration of the style and language of the works known by the name of the Parisishṭas which mark the last outskirts of the Sútra period. What distinguishes these Parisishṭas from the Sútras is that they treat everything in a popular and superficial manner as if the time was gone when students would spend ten or twenty years of their lives in fathoming the mysteries and mastering the intricacies of the Bráhmaṇa Literature. The tendency to make everything easy even to the extent of superficiality, leads one to think that the party

which had to follow such tactics had to fight against a strong enemy who was gaining more and more ground in the course of time. Even the adoption of the Sútra-style proves the fact that in the opinion of the authors of the Sútras, no one would listen to wisdom unless it is clothed in a garb of clear argument and communicated in intelligible language. Thus the Sútra-period must be contemporaneous with the gradual decline of Brahmanism and the steady rise of Buddhism, a stage of thought which is distinctly reflected in the Pariśishṭas. From this point of view also, it follows that the Sútra-period should extend from 600 to 200 B. C.

As the Sútras necessarily presuppose the existence of the Bráhmaṇas whose complicated system of theology and ceremonial was sought to be simplified by the Sútras, the Bráhmaṇa-period extends backward from 600 B. C. to 800 B. C., taking about 200 years to be the minimum period sufficient for the progress of thought and literary activity, such as, the establishment of the three-fold ceremonial, the composition and collection of the Bráhmaṇas and the ramification of the Bráhmaṇa Charaṇas.

The Bráhmaṇa-period however, exhibits a stratum of thought perfectly unintelligible without the admission of a preceding age, during which all that is misunderstood, perverted and absurd in the Bráhmaṇas, had its natural growth. But even between these two ages, there must have been an age when the spirit was at work in the literature of India, no longer creative, free and original, but living only on the heritage of a former age collecting, classifying and imitating.

This may be called the Mantra-period and may be supposed to have extended over two hundred years, i. e. from 1000 to 800 B. C.

The three periods of Vedic literature spoken of so far, i. e. the Sútra, Bráhmaṇa and Mantra periods, all point to some earlier age which gave birth to the hymns of the early Ṛishis—a time when the songs which were collected with such careful zeal in the Mantra-period, commented upon with such elaborate pedantry during the Bráhmaṇa-period, and examined and analysed with such minute exactness during the Sútra period, lived and were understood without any effort,—a time characterised by spontaneity, originality and truth. This Chhandas-period may be supposed to extend over 200 years i. e. from 1200 to 1000 B. C. Thus the date of Ṛigveda would fall about 1200 B. C.

The unsatisfactory character of this view may be easily seen. In the first place, arguments based on the nature of language and thought are not, generally speaking, conclusive in themselves, unless they are supported by any other independent proof.

Secondly, the theory is based upon some assumptions which have yet to be proved conclusively—*e. g.* the identity of the Vedic Kátyáyana and the grammarian Kátyáyana, and the historical importance to be attached to the statements of षड्गुरुशिष्य and सोमदेव भट्ट which are the main planks in the whole argument.

Thirdly, there is not sufficient reason shown why 200 years in particular should be assigned to each of the periods in the Vedic Literature. We may as well assign 500 or 1000 years to each of them. And there

are other scholars who have done the same. Of course, Max Müller has concluded his remarks with the following qualification:—"The chronological limits assigned to the Sútra and Bráhmaṇa periods will seem to most Sanskṛit scholars too narrow rather than too wide, and if we assign but 200 years to the Mantra period from 800 to 1000 B. C., and an equal number to the Chhandas period, from 1000 to 1200 B. C., we can do so only under the supposition that during the early periods of history, the growth of the human mind was more luxuriant than in later times, and that the layers of thought were framed less slowly in the primary than in the tertiary ages of the world." It may be seen that the estimate made by Max Müller is ridiculously low even from the point of view of the progress of language and thought. The difference of character between the Vedic Sanskrit and the Classical Sanskṛit is so great that it must have required a very long period indeed for the language to progress from one step of development to another, as may appear probable from a comparison of the history of other languages and it must be remembered that the Classical Sanskṛit which we have at present has been substantially unaltered in nature and essence since the 2nd century B.C., I mean since the Mahábháshya of Patanjali. Even Max Müller himself afterwards called this estimate too low and named the period from 1500–1200 B. C. as the period of composition of the Vedic hymns.

Similar estimates have been made by other scholars. Thus, Whitney calls the period from 2000–1500 B. C. the period of the oldest hymns—an estimate—says

Kaegi—which if we take everything into account is certainly not too high and which has the greatest claims to probability. Benfey also says:—' It can hardly be doubted that the most eastern branch had their abode on the Indus as early as 2000 years before the Christian era. Weber has placed the migration into the Indus land in the 16th century B. C.

Thus it may be seen that the linguistic or literary theories fail to fix with certainty the date of the Ṛigveda. As Kaegi remarks, the determination of the Vedic period...deduced...from the difference in language and in the religious and social views between the hymns and the fixed dates of Buddhism, can approximate the true period only by centuries.

But there are the astronomical theories which have advanced the question of the Vedic age considerably and which at least possess far greater certainty than the theories merely based upon a consideration and comparison of language and thought.

Thus Haug on the ground of a passage in the Vedânga--Jyotisha, referring to the position of the solstitial points determines the age of the Veda. The poisition given in this passage* carries us back to the year 1186 B. C. which must be the time of the Vedânga-Jyotisha—Dr. Haug comes to two conclusions from this reference--(1) that the Indians had made already such a considerable progress in astronomical science early in the 12th century B. C.

* प्रपद्येते श्रविष्ठादौ सूर्याचन्द्रमसावुदक् ।
सार्पार्धे दक्षिणार्कस्तु माघश्रावणयोः सदा ॥

Rig-Veda Jyot. Verse 6.

as to enable them to take such observations; and (2) that by that time the whole ritual in its main features as laid down in the Bráhmaṇas was complete. Thus he assigns the composition of the bulk of the Bráhmaṇas to the years 1400–1200 B. C. Taking 500–600 years for the Saṁhitá, the bulk of the Saṁhitá falls between 2000 to 1400 B. C. The oldest hymns and sacrificial formulas being a few hundred years more ancient still, the very commencement of Vedic Literature may be fixed between 2400–2000 B. C.

Shankara Bálkrishṇa Díkshit, in his 'Bháratiya Jyotihshastra' has hit upon one passage in the Śatapatha Bráhmaṇa which determines the age of the work–
'एकं द्वे त्रीणि चत्वारीति वा अन्यानि नक्षत्राण्यथैता एव भूयिष्ठा यत्कृत्तिकास्तद्भूमानमेवैतदुपैति तस्मात्कृत्तिकास्वादधीत ॥ एता ह वै प्राच्यै दिशो न च्यवंते सर्वाणि ह वा अन्यानि नक्षत्राणि प्राच्यै दिशश्च्यवंते।.........'

Śatapatha Bráhmaṇa 2-1-2.

The phenomenon that the कृत्तिकाs were seen to rise exactly at the eastern point from which they never swerved (whereas at present they rise a little to the northern side of the eastern point), points, to a period about 3000 years B. C. which must be, therefore, the time of the composition of the Śatapatha Bráhmaṇa. The Taittiríya Saṁhitá which must have preceded the Śatapatha, and which also mentions Kṛittiká and other Nakshatras, must be about 200 years before this period while the Ṛig-Veda Saṁhitá which is decisively older than the Taittiríya Saṁhitá must be still older.

Mr. Tilak in his 'Orion' has proved even a greater antiquity for the hymns of the Ṛigveda. He has endeavoured to show therein that 'the traditions

recorded in the Ṛigveda unmistakably point to a period not later than 4000 B. C., when the vernal equinox was in Orion, or, in other words, when the Dog-star (or the Dog as we have it in the Ṛigveda) commenced the equinoctial year.'* On the ground of the several astronomical references scattered about in the ancient Sanskṛit Literature, he has arrived at four different periods. The oldest period is the Aditi or pre-Orion period, with the vernal equinox at or near Punarvasu, roughly extending from 6000 B. C. to 4000 B. C. It was a period when the finished hymns do not seem to have been known, and half prose and half poetical Nivids or sacrificial formulæ "giving the principal names, epithets and feats of the deity invoked" were probably in use. The next is the Orion period, roughly extending from 4000 B. C. to 2500 B. C., from the time when the vernal equinox was in the asterism of Ârdrá to the time when it receded to the asterism of the Kṛittikás. The whole of the so-called वृषाकपि hymn X.86 which is very obscure, can be at least more satisfactorily explained than has hitherto been done both by Indian commentators and modern European scholars, on the supposition that it refers to the fact of the equinoxes coinciding with the Orion. This second period is the most important period in the history of the Aryan civilization. A good many *Súktas* in the Ṛigveda were sung at this time. This is the proper, most active, Vedic period. The third is the Kṛittiká period, commencing with the vernal equinox in the asterism of the Kṛittikás and extending upto the period recorded

* Tilak, Orion, Preface iii.

in the Vedánga Jyotisha, *i. e*, from 2500 B. C. to 1400 B. C. It was the period of the Taittiríya Saṁhitá and several of the Bráhmaṇas. The hymns of the Ṛigveda had already become antique and unintelligible by this time and speculations, often too free, about the real meaning of these hymns and legends, were indulged in. The fourth and the last period extends from 1400 B. C. to 500 B. C. or to the birth and rise of Buddhism. It was the period of the Sútras and philosophical systems.

Prof. Jacobi also has put forth a theory according to which the period of the Ṛigveda goes back to at least 4000 B. C.; a theory also based on astronomical calculations connected with a change in the beginning of the seasons which has taken place since the time of the Ṛigveda.